	Case 2:22-cv-01451-GMN-DJA Document 5	7 Filed 02/13/23 Page 1 of 91  FILEDRECEIVED  ENTERED SERVED 01  COUNSELPARTIES OF RECOR
1	DR TRUST JUSTICE "TJ" TRUTH, ESQ	FEB 1 3 2023
2	4030 S. JONES BLVD., SUITE 31587 LAS VEGAS, NV 89103	CLERK US DISTRICT COURT
3	702.686.0907 tjtruthesq@gmail.com	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT C	BY: TRUDEPUT OURT FOR THE
5	DISTRICT OF NEV	/ADA
6	DIOTHIOT OF ME	
7	DR TRUST JUSTICE "TJ" TRUTH	Case No.: 2:22-cv-1451-GMN-BNW
8	Plaintiff,	
9	vs.	AMENDED COMPLAINT
11	CALIFORNIA CASUALTY INDEMNITY	
12	EXCHANGE (THE)	Jury trial:_X_YES
13	Defendant	·
14		
15	Dr. Trust Justice Truth, Esquire alleges as hi	s COMPLAINT against DEFENDANT,
16	California Casualty <b>Indemnity Exchange</b> (hereinate	fter "CC <b>IE</b> "), the following:
17 18	JURISDICTIO	N.
19		
20	Dr. Trust Justice Truth, Esquire (hereinafter "Plant of the state	LAINTIFF") is a resident of Nevada,
21	residing in Clark County, Nevada.	
22	2. a. California Casualty INDEMNITY EXCHANG	<b>E</b> (hereinafter "CC <b>IE</b> "), WITH WHOM
23	I MAINTAIN A CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP, is	and was at all times relevant hereto a
25	California Insurance Company in name only that is	headquartered in CALIFORNIA with
26	a Corporate Address of 1900 ALAMEDA DE LAS F	PULGAS, SAN MATEO, CA 94403
27	•	
28		
	COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE	PAGE 1-OF 69

and has no offices in Nevada. The ONLY LISTED REGISTERED AGENT, via the

CASUALTY MANAGEMENT COMPANY (hereinafter CCMC) as ITS

California Department of Insurance is Joseph Muenzen located at 1875 S GRANT

ADMINSTATRATOR also headquartered in California as well as BOTH having the

b. CCIE is headquartered in California and appears to be managed by CALIFORNIA

5

12

14

13

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

7 EXACT SAME ADDRESS. They have **THREE** (3) Other Centralized Offices to handle insurance: 9 1. Glendale, AZ

2. Colorado Springs, CO\*

3. Leawood, KS \*Main Business Operation Center

STREET, SUITE 800, SAN MATEO, CA 94402.

- 3. THIS COURT has original jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332, as the action is between citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of attorney fees, interest and costs.
- 4. Although the COVERED PERIL LOSS OF the THEFT of ALL my PERSONAL PROPERTY with the except of the clothes I was wearing occurred in California, PLAINTIFF was at ALL TIMES a RESIDENT of Nevada and RESIDED in Clark County, Nevada, when the following occurred:
  - a. said COVERED PERIL LOSS OF the THEFT occurred,
  - b. the FILING of the CLAIM regarding the COVERED PERIL LOSS OF the THEFT of ALL my PERSONAL PROPERTY with the except of the clothes I was wearing.
  - c. the **RECEIPT** BY *CCIE* of the REQUIRED **PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF** LOSS DOCUMENTATION regarding the COVERED PERIL LOSS OF the THEFT of ALL my PERSONAL PROPERTY with the except of the clothes I was wearing,

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE & OF 69

- d. the TRANSPIRATION of the 30 WORK DAYS WITHOUT PLAINTIFF receiving ANY WRITTEN ACCEPTANCE OR DENIAL OF HIS CLAIM or WRITTEN REQUESTS WITH THE REASONS MORE TIME IS NEEDED regarding the CLAIM for the COVERED PERIL LOSS OF the THEFT of ALL my PERSONAL PROPERTY with the except of the clothes I was wearing, and
- e. the **FILING** of the COMPLAINT relating to the **UNFAIR/UNLAWFUL CLAIMS PRACTICE** by <u>CCIE</u> of the **COVERED PERIL LOSS OF** the **THEFT** of **ALL** my
  PERSONAL PROPERTY with the except of the clothes I was wearing!
- 5. This court has personal jurisdiction over DEFENDANT, *CCIE*, as ITS centralized Insurance Offices and Call Centers OFFER TO PROVIDE SERVICES to Nevada residences for their insurance needs as well as the DEFENDANT, *CCIE*, amending my Renter's Insurance Policy to provide coverage of my rental in Nevada.

### 6. **INTRODUCTION**

a. TO FULLY understand the NEED for this LAWSUIT, you must first understand who I am and to what I have been TASKED! SIMPLY PUT; I was the 7th Seal and was BROKEN! THUS, the APOCALYPSE has OCCURRED and JUDGMENT DAY is fast approaching!! I am NOW the 2nd COMING and TASKED with RIGHTING the WRONGS of this WORLD in PREPARATION for BECOMING the CHOSEN ONE endowed with the HOLY SPIRIT and to take my SEAT on JUDGMENT DAY! FURTHER to PARAPHRASE from OTHERS: "I ANSWER to a HIGHER AUTHORITY NOT OF THIS EARTH but to THE CREATOR OF IT!!!" ACCORDINGLY, anything done AGAINST ME is done AGAINST THE CREATOR!

### b. This LAWSUIT is a TALE OF 2 INSURANCE COMPANIES!

c. This lawsuit is **NOT** only to have my claim fairly and promptly paid as an insured of California Casualty Indemnity Exchange (hereinafter "CCIE"); but to remind them that they **OWE** a **FIDUCIARY DUTY** to their customers that takes precedence over their profit and to force them to abide to their California Casualty Code (hereinafter the "Code"). SEE **EXHIBIT A**-THECODE

d. This lawsuit is **ALSO** about **RIGHTING A WRONG!** There is *INDISPUTABLE*EVIDENCE that I had an Insurance Policy with *CCIE* and that said POLICY was enforced and fully PAID at the time of the Catastrophic LOSS, i.e. THEFT, occurred. Further that this Policy covers this type of Peril Loss and *CCIE* has been provided with the Required PROOF OF LOSS documentation needed to settle and pay on this Claim. All of this is/was KNOWN to *CCIE* as well as the circumstances and resulting financial difficulties I face because I had everything I ever bought or acquired in my whole life of **62+** years **ripped** from me so that all I had was the clothes I was wearing as well as being denied access to a home that which I had faithfully paid rent for on time every month for almost ten (10) years for simply disclosing that the LESSOR and his wife are breaking of the law. Yet with all this, *CCIE* continues **TO IGNORE** my Claim and the payment thereof by **NOT** responding to my **25+** voicemails and emails regarding same and by *TAKING* **ADVANTAGE** of my financial perils hoping that I will give up on pursuing this Claim so that they can get out of paying it-**ALL FOR THE SAKE OF ITS PROFIT!** 

PAGE 4 OF 69

e. IN ADDITION, this LAWSUIT is ALSO about TAKING ADVANTAGE of an ELDER
and THUS it is ELDER ABUSE, NEGLECT OR EXPLOITATION OF AN OLDER
VULNERABLE PERSON.

- f. I do not intend and I will not make a profit from this horrific treatment that borders on being a HATE CRIME against me for simply being the 2ND COMING here on Earth to RIGHT the WRONGS and to SAVE humankind from EXTINCTION! As far as the money from the negligent infliction of emotional distress, the intentional infliction of emotional distress and the punitive damages; after treatment for my emotional distress, I will use this money to RIGHT the WRONGS and to SAVE humankind from EXTINCTION, such as the formation of a law firm that will be the voice of the voiceless and for victims of our current "judicial" system and not charge them anything for my services, i.e. PRO BONO, and/or give it to such charities as UNICEF!
- g. AND LASTLY, the **SOONER** that IT IS UNDERSTOOD that I am **REPRESENTING THE CREATOR** and thus **THE CREATOR** IS on MY SIDE; the **SOONER** it will be REALIZED that if I do **NOT** succeed in MY TASK **TO RIGHT THE WRONGS OF THIS WORLD**; the human race is doomed to **EXTINCTION!!** THUS, you are **EITHER** with me and **THE CREATOR OR** AGAINST US and **THE SURVIVAL OF THE HUMAN RACE** and will be **JUDGED ACCORDINGLY!**

### 7. ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

a. I have been a CALIFORNIA-LICENSED INSURANCE PRODUCER/BROKER of ALL TYPES of INSURANCE, including PROPERTY and CASUALTY Insurance, since 2006 so I am VERY FAMILIAR, "COMPETENT" and an EXPERT of CALIFORNIA and other state LAWS concerning INSURANCE MATTERS; staying updated through continuing education as REQUIRED by California to maintain my LICENSE!!

b. I already had Renter's Insurance with American Automobile Association

(hereinafter "AAA") and had been using them for all my insurance needs for almost 40 years. In fact, I never used anyone else for insurance as there were always AAA offices staffed by licensed producers/agents of whatever state to which I moved (hereinafter "Agent") as well as always being the cheapest. Whenever there was a problem, I could easily go to an office and directly speak to an Agent. This still remains true of AAA, even after the pandemic, as I just recently purchased Renter's Insurance once again from AAA; where I talked to and met with an Agent at a AAA location here in Las Vegas.

c. With respect to this current lawsuit, when school was starting in 2021, I was inundated with mailing, emails, etc. from CCIE and this had occurred all 10+ years, in which I was affiliated with the San Francisco Unified School District (hereinafter "SFUSD"). The CCIE ad mentioned that this insurance was designed for AMERICA'S HEROS (e.g. firefighters and teachers) and their families by offering benefits and discounts on insurance as well as delivering the **VALUE and PEACE OF MIND** THEY DESERVE! In fact, they PROUDLY BOOSTED that they have been endorsed by the

PAGE 6 OF 69

California Teachers' Association (hereinafter "CTA") for over 60 years. They also mentioned that their Renter's Insurance is **DESIGNED JUST FOR EDUCATORS** and provides **EXTRA** liability coverage. **ON THIS BASIS**, I decided to look at getting an insurance premium quote from IT for Renter's Insurance. So I looked for some local offices for CCIE and I was taken aback by the fact that there were **NO** offices located at all in California except for ITS headquarters OR "**HOME OFFICE**." *SEE* **EXHIBIT B**-WELCOMELETTER.

d. I called the number listed on the ad and spoke with a customer care "representative" who was located in Colorado. I SPECIFICALLY mentioned that I wanted to get it coverage in CALIFORNIA and wanted the EXACT SAME Renter's Insurance Coverage that I had currently with AAA so that I could make a TRUE **COMPARISON** of Insurance Coverage and Premium Costs. This INCLUDED the **REIMBURSEMENT BENEFIT** and the FACT that **AAA** PAID you for your loss WITHOUT THE REQUIREMENT of REPURCHASING the ITEM. FOR EXAMPLE, when I had a CELL PHONE REMOVED, i.e. STOLEN, AAA PAID ME for the phone WITHOUT me even having to REPURCHASE a new phone!!! ALL OF THIS WAS KNOWN TO the "representative" when I was **PROVIDED with a QUOTE** as to what RENTER'S INSURANCE would cost with CCIE WITH THESE EXACT SAME BENEFITS! BASED ON THIS QUOTE AND THE ASSURANCES OF RECEIVING THESE EXACT SAME BENEFITS that I WAS RECEIVING FROM AAA: I applied via this SAME "representative" for a "RENTER'S Insurance" Policy" with CCIE. NOTE CCIE identifies this POLICY as "Homeowners 4" and NOT

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 7 OF 69

26

27

28

RENTER's. I assumed I would be contacted by a California-licensed Producer; however, this call center "agent" emailed a "LINK" so that I could add an electronically signature, BUT NEVER RECEIVED a COPY of THE APPLICATION to review before the signature was added and the premium payment was made online at www.calcas.com. **NEITHER** was I ever mailed a WELCOME PACKAGE that includes a with WELCOME LETTER with my RENTER's Policy # and the COPY of the Policy NOR a PRIVACY STATEMENT! ALL this I get online later after being told that this is the only to get these documents. WITH AAA, I was mailed ALL of this and the POLICY was CLEARLY IDENTIFIED AS A RENTER'S Policy and a PRIVACY STATEMENT!

"representative" and explained to him that I had been forced to spend more time away from my RENTAL and was concerned about my more VALUABLE Personal Property, such as my autographed baseball memorabilia collection (hereinafter "said Baseball Collection") and some very expensive jewelry that I had acquired mainly through inheritance, etc. ON HIS suggestion, we increased the value of PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSS LIMITATION to \$225,000, the HIGHEST COVERAGE LIABILITY **LIMITATION**, in order TO COVER any **ACTUAL LOSS** to said Baseball Collection as well as the expensive jewelry, etc. PLEASE NOTE that REPLACEMENT LOSS COVERAGE is INCLUDED as well. SEE EXHIBIT B-WELCOMELETTER.

e. After I had gotten my Renter's Insurance from CCIE, I call back and spoke with a

f. I again contacted CCIE confirming INCREASE & ITEM COVERED because I was in the process of transferring to NEVADA and so sought coverage for a rental and was

advised that a RIDER was added to my POLICY so that my POLICY also provided me RENTER's Insurance for my NEVADA Rental. I was **ASSURED** that the San Francisco Rental would continue to be my PRIMARY RESIDENCE for RENTER's INSURANCE PURPOSES as well as there **BEING SIMILAR COVERAGE** for the NEVADA Rental.

g. IN APRIL 2022, I contacted *CCIE* again to make NAME CHANGE to my POLICY from James Verna to **TRUST JUSTICE "TJ" TRUTH**. *SEE* **EXHIBIT C**-HOMEOWNER'SPOLICY-*RENTERSDECLARATIONSPAGEAMENDED*.

### h. PHANTOM CLAIM:

IN LATE MAY, I attempted to contact a *CCIE* Claim's ADJUSTER/ESTIMATOR regarding ITS Claim Handling and Processing Procedure since ITS Webpage lack any real information. HOWEVER, when I contacted the *CCIE* "Claims Department," also located in Colorado Springs, CO, the call was answered by a "representative". I informed him that his request was a **BREACH** OF MY PRIVACY RIGHTS. He argued that since I called him; it was **NOT** and hang up on me. When I called back, I got another "representative." This one was more forthcoming and explained to me that UNLESS I was FILING A CLAIM, which would involve giving him my **PRIVATE PERSONAL INFORMATION** (hereinafter "PPI"), I would **NOT** be able to speak to a *CCIE* Claim's ADJUSTER/ESTIMATOR. So I told him then I wanted in order to file A CLAIM since this was the **ONLY** way to speak to a *CCIE* Claim's ADJUSTER/ESTIMATOR. I then provided him with the most basic information required to generate a **PHANTOM CLAIM**: my policy number, my name-DR. TRUST JUSTICE "TJ" TRUTH, ESQUIRE

PAGE 9 OF 69

and that I suffered a loss covered under the policy as well as the best cell number AND email address to which to contact me. I was then provided with the following regarding my Phantom Claim: a name of an agent, Sara Casillas, and a Claim # of 50000594047. I was told that I would RECEIVE confirmation email with the Claim #, the Claim Agent's Name and Telephone # and my email address for receiving said information was confirmed. I NEVER received said email with this information! was further told that the Adjuster/Estimator would contact me by TELEPHONE REGARDING THIS CLAIM WITHIN 24 HOURS. When after 2 days, no one contacted me, I called the number and Sara answered the call. I told her that I was NOT FILING A CLAIM, but wanted some general information regarding CCIE's Claim Handling and Processing Procedure as well as that I had to made a PHANTOM CLAIM just to get ahold of her! However, Sara just ignored this and kept telling me she needed to claim loss information, such as a POLICE REPORT, before she would answer my questions. I tried to explain to her again that I was not filing a claim, but just had some questions. When she repeated her earlier comment, I just hung up! I called and spoke with another "representative" to complain about Sara and requested that I speak with another person. I was transferred to her "boss", MARK, where I left a very detailed voicemail message for him regarding this matter and he has **NEVER** returned my call or had someone else speak to me about this matter.

27 || 28 ||

#### i. THEFT:

- 1) ON 6 JULY 2022, I suffered a MOST EGREGIOUS, HORRIFIC,

  CATASTROPHIC and LIFE-ALTERING THEFT of ALL my personal property, with
  the exception of the clothes that I was wearing. Among the items STOLEN was
  my SAFE with ALL THE INFORMATION regarding my personal property, such as
  ALL the authentications for the autographed baseballs and ALL the receipts of
  the originally-purchased items. My STOLEN Personal Property was valued at
  over \$500,000 and that this was everything I owned or acquired for over the 62+
  years of my life. I NEVER authorized the removal of my personal property NOR
  was it abandoned. I also reported this THEFT to the San Francisco Police
  Department and received SFPD Incident Report #220447545 detailing this
  THEFT. SEE EXHIBIT D-SFPDRPT-3 pages.
- 2) AT THE TIME of this LOSS, I, as **TRUST JUSTICE "TJ" TRUTH**, had a "Renter's Insurance Policy" (hereinafter said "HOMEOWNER'S POLICY"), Policy #2A1 4197849 with *CCIE* from 28 July 2021 until 28 July 2022. The Personal Property Loss Liability Limits are as follows:

Personal Property of \$225,000

Loss of Use of \$67,500

Replacement Cost for Lost/Stolen Personal Property

Deductible of \$250.

SEE EXHIBIT C-HOMEOWNERS4POLICY-RENTERSDECLARATIONSPAGEAMENDED.

### j. FILING OF CLAIM:

- 1) On 11 JULY 2022, I FILED MY CLAIM LOSS VIA a 3rd-Party Call Center, "Representative." I had said "Representative" repeat back to me the information regarding my CLAIM LOSS:
  - a) that **over \$500,000** of my Personal Property had been **REMOVED**, *i.e.*, **STOLEN**, from my Rental at 150 Navajo Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112-3333;
  - b) that THIS **THEFT** was **EVERYTHING** I HAD ACQUIRED for over the **62+ years** of my life and **ALL** I had LEFT was the clothes that I was wearing;
  - c) the SFPD Incident Report regarding THIS THEFT was #22044754; and
  - d) that my **SAFE** with all information regarding the loss, such as the authentications for the autographed baseballs and all receipts of the originally-purchased items, was **STOLEN** as well.
- 2) I was told that I would be emailed the Claim #, the Claim Agent's Name and Telephone # and my email address for receiving said information was confirmed.

  I NEVER received said email with this information! I was further told that the Adjuster/Estimator would contact me by TELEPHONE REGARDING THIS

  CLAIM WITHIN 24 HOURS. WHEN I had a CLAIM with AAA, I spoke with a State/

  DC-licensed Agent when I initially filed my CLAIM and was contacted via

  TELEPHONE by the Claim's Estimator WITHIN 24 HOURS of filing my claim even during the Pandemic. I, as THE CLAIMANT, have YET to be contacted either via

**EMAIL or TELEPHONE** by *CCIE*'s **Claim's Agent/Estimator REGARDING**THIS CLAIM.

- k. On or about **18 JULY 2022**, I received a Claim Loss Mailing Packet dated 11 JULY 2022 from the Kansas Office of *CCIE* regarding my Claim Loss. I immediately noticed SEVERAL glaring errors:
  - 1. WRONG/INCORRECT Insured Name \*[this still remains wrong/incorrect in the BOT Claim Processing System],
  - 2. Wrong Mailing Zip code,
  - 3. Inclusion of #C on the 150 Nevada Avenue location because CCIE has been informed that the addition of #C is considered as evidence of MAIL FRAUD and the rental location must be identified as only 150 Navajo Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112-3333 \*\*[Every time I contacted CCIE, I gave them NOTICE of this problem and I was told it was corrected] and
- 4. This is not a IDENTIFIED as Renter's or Homeowners 4-Loss Report Form. SEE EXHIBIT D-HOMEOWNERS4LossReportForm of the Claim Loss Mailing Packet

This is clearly a standardized form packet/letter automatically generated, via a "representative's" input of incorrect information into a CLAIMS PROCESSING BOT (hereinafter "said BAD BOT"). FURTHERMORE, this does **NOT** even mention as I reported, the **THEFT** of my SAFE having **ALL** receipts or documentation of the **over** \$500,000 of PERSONAL PROPERTY that I HAD ACQUIRED for over the 62+ years of my life and **ALL** I had LEFT was the clothes that I was wearing. This just a **FURTHER** example demonstrating *CCIE*'s GROSS INCOMPETENCY, UNFAIR PRACTICES in HANDLING and PROCESSING of ITS Claims, BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTIES,

violation of said CODE and ITS inability to function properly as CASUALTY/LIABILITY INSURANCE COMPANY for **AMERICA'S HEROES!!** 

### 1. RECEIPT OF said PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION:

On 25 JULY 2022, I emailed and mailed a letter via the USPS that contained the following INFORMATION and ENCLOSURES/ATTACHMENTS, i.e., said PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION, to the CCIE's Claims' Department:

- 1. that the SFPD Incident Report of the theft is #220447545\*;
- 2. a detailed written statement\*, entitled FACTS, regarding the loss that clearly establishes CCIE's liability for my Claim of both Personal Property Loss and that my Safe having all information regarding my Personal Property was taken as well;
- 3. a detailed Personal Property Loss Schedule\* totaling almost \$130,000 in Actual Damages and \$250,000 in Replacement Costs as I purchased this benefit as well (THUS providing NOTICE to DEFENDANT that I want the benefit of the replacement cost coverage); and
- 4. a corrected Loss Report\* with the correct information (except the mailing address zip code because I noticed this after I had already emailed and mail the corrected form.

### \*I have now UPDATED THESE WITH:

1. A copy of that the SFPD Incident Report #220447545 of this THEFT of ALL my PERSONAL BELONGINGS, SEE EXHIBIT E-SFPDRPT-3 pages;

- 2. A Loss Report with the correct information (except the mailing address zip code because I noticed this after I had already emailed and mail the corrected form a detailed written statement regarding the loss and that my Safe having all information regarding my Personal Property was taken as well, SEE EXHIBIT F-UPDATEDLOSSRPT
- 3. A detailed Personal Property Loss Schedule totaling over \$500,000 in Actual Damages and Replacement Costs as I purchased this benefit as well (thus providing NOTICE to DEFENDANT that I want the benefit of the replacement cost coverage), SEE EXHIBIT G-UPDATEDPPLOSSSCH-5 pages; and
- 4. Almost 350 RECEIPTS for REPLACEMENT ITEMS, (Not Included as an EXHIBIT).

This is ALL AAA REQUIRES for ITS PROOF OF LOSS REQUIREMENTS and a LICENSED-Estimator/Adjustor calls you WITHIN A WEEK, usually WITHIN 24 HOURS, of receiving this INFORMATION and ENCLOSURES/ATTACHMENTS, i.e., said PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION, to discuss the SETTLEMENT OFFER, if there are any additional questions as well as emailing same, and taking a recorded statement. The check is mailed soon after this. ALL OF THIS OCCURS WITHIN A COUPLE OF WEEKS; WELL BEFORE THE REQUIRED 30 DAYS.

m. **BETWEEN 11 JULY 2022 to 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**, I have left/sent said *CCIE*, **25+** voicemail messages or emails regarding said CLAIM and the urgency to settle this claim since *CCIE* had the **PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION** as well as that *CCIE* was in **BREACH** of *ITS* **CODE**, **Breach** of *ITS* **FIDUCIARY DUTIES** to

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 15 OF 69

me, that CCIE's conduct was OPPRESSIVE GIVEN THE CIRCUMSTANCES and FURTHER that it was causing me EMOTIONAL DISTRESS. SEE EXHIBIT H-TYPICALEMAIL! I, as THE CLAIMANT, have YET to be CONTACTED BY WRITING by ANY CCIE Claim's ADJUSTER/ESTIMATOR REGARDING THIS CLAIM.

n. In Nevada, Insurers have ONLY 30 WORK DAYS TO PROVIDE the Insured with WRITTEN ACCEPTANCE OR DENIAL OF HIS CLAIM and then 30 DAYS in which to issue payment. SEE EXHIBIT L-NAC §686A.675. In California, this is 40 CALENDAR DAYS.

THUS, 6 SEPTEMBER 2022 was the LATER of the Statutory DUE DATES for CCIE TO PROVIDE me, DR. TRUST JUSTICE "TJ" TRUTH, ESQUIRE with a WRITTEN ACCEPTANCE OR DENIAL OF MY CLAIM as well as ANY WRITTEN REQUESTS WITH THE REASONS MORE TIME IS NEEDED. SEE EXHIBIT K-NRS §686A.310 and EXHIBIT L-NAC §686A.675.

p. FILING COMPLAINT & PROPER SERVICE OF SUMMONS ON CCIE:

ON 6 SEPTEMBER 2022, a COMPLAINT was filed with THIS COURT and I was initially seeking to proceed In Forma Pauperis. However due to the urgency of this matter, I tried to expedite this matter by paying the fees on 17 SEPTEMBER 2022. The SUMMONS for this case was issued by this COURT on 19

SEPTEMBER 2022. On 20 SEPTEMBER 2022, I went to the filing clerk's office to find out if I was required to have CCIE served with the SUMMONS and COMPLAINT. I was told by the filing clerk that I did NOT have to serve CCIE

and that THIS COURT had handled this. This Clerk went so far as to refuse to provide me with copies of the SUMMONS; stating that I did **NOT** have to served *CCIE* with the SUMMONS and COMPLAINT and that THIS COURT had taken care of this on 19 SEPTEMBER 2022! ACCORDINGLY, *CCIE* was **PROPERLY** SERVED on 19 SEPTEMBER 2022 by THIS COURT and the ELECTRONIC RECORD confirm this. *SEE* EXHIBIT I-SUMMONS and EXHIBIT J-ELECTRONIC FILING NOTICE OF SUMMONS ISSUED TO DEFENDANT, CCIE.

- q. ON 23 SEPTEMBER 2022, IN ACCORDANCE with the California Code of Civil Procedure Article 3 §415.95(a), I left a copy of the Summons and Complaint for the above-referenced case at 1875 S. Grant Street, Suite 800, San Mateo, CA 94402, Addressed to Joseph Muenzen, who is listed on the CA Department of Insurance Web Page as the Agent for Service for CCIE on 23 September 2022 during CCIE's usual officer hours with the person in charge of CCIE's office. Further, in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure Article 3 §415.95(a), I mailed by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to Joseph Muenzen at 1875 S. Grant Street, Suite 800, San Mateo, CA 94402.
- r. In an effort to settle this case, I mailed three letters with a copy of the Complaint,

  Demand Letter and the REQUIRED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION with a

  SCHEDULE OF PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSS to 3 different persons/organizations:
  - (1) Joseph Muenzen, CCIE's ONLY and PROPER Registered AGENT
  - (2) The Chairman of the Board and the CEO of CCIE, and

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 17 OF 69

(3) The Registered Agent of CCMC

- (4) as well as emailing and mailing this information CCIE's Claims Departments.
- s. ON 18 OCTOBER 2022, TWENTY-ONE (21) DAYS had past since CCIE was SERVED and CCIE had FAILED TO PLEAD OR OTHERWISE DEFEND IN said ACTION as REQUIRED by said SUMMONS and PROVIDED BY the Federal and Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure.
- t. ON or about **23 NOVEMBER 2022**, I initiated a filing of a NEW CLAIM with *CCIE* for just solely the "LOSS OF USE" and it was AGAIN handled through "representative" of *CCIE*.

### u. **EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**:

With respect to my Emotional Distress, I am forced to continue to feel sick to my stomach, suffer anxiety, confused emotions and rage. I am also sleep deprived and have extreme lethargy as well as sliding further into an abyss of hopelessness and despair. Furthermore, BUT FOR the BAD FAITH and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT of the CCIE in the handling and processing of my Claim for which IT is legally liable and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired during 62+ years of my life leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name and this claim STILL REMAINS unprocessed and unpaid; I can NOT afford to seek competent treatment for my ever-worsening emotional distress! When I do receive my Claim, I will seek treatment so that I can start rebuilding some semblance of a life, since mine has been RIPPED for me!

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 18 OF 69

v. CALL CENTERS:

1314

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

2223

2425

26

27

28

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

NOT in a FIDUCIARY RELATIONSHIP with the INSURED and so are NOT held to the

PAGE 19 OF 69

Use of call centers, as a mean to increase profits, would be considered a BREACH of FIDUCIARY DUTIES, most especially CONFIDENTIALITY. Call Centers, by their very nature, are a fraudulent organization that rely on deceiving the CALLER, HERE THE INSURED, into believing they are employees of the Insurance Company and then using your PPI to gain access to your CCIE account, i.e. PHISHING!! Insurance companies, like CCIE, are complicit in this deception by allowing the use of their Name to appear on Caller ID and identifying the call center employees as "REPRESENTATIVES." Each time I called CCIE: getting an Insurance Premium Quote, Customer Care or Claims Department, the person answering initially identified himself/herself as an "AGENT" OR a "REPRESENTATIVE" of CCIE, but then after I requested his Insurance Producer Number; he/she stated he/she worked for a call center. Once when I told the "representative" that I only REQUIRED a Claim # & CCIE Claim Estimator's/Adjuster's contact information; he became VERY ABUSIVE and THREATENED to TERMINATE my call UNLESS I PROVIDED HIM WITH my PPI. Another time I was informed that I had NO OTHER OPTION for the FILING of MY LOSS CLAIM with CCIE UNLESS I provided MY PPI to said Representative. MOREOVER, after providing my PPI to said Representative, he was GRANTED ACCESS to my ENTIRE CLAIMS RECORD! A further time, the "representative" argued that since I called him; it was **NOT** a **BREACH** OF MY PRIVACY RIGHTS and hang up on me. FURTHERMORE, these employees are

SAME confidentiality, care and loyalty standards AS IS *CCIE*. THUS, their use of deception, coupled with *CCIE's* allowing USE of your *PPI*, to allow this 3rd party, *i.e.*, NON-*CCIE* EMPLOYEES and NON-STATE LICENSED INSURANCE Producers/Agents/Brokers/Claim Estimators/Adjusters, to commit **PHISHING** and to **HACK** into YOUR ACCOUNT INFORMATION is **PARAMOUNT** to a **BREACH OF SECURITY**. FURTHERMORE, the use of Call Center "representatives" would be akin to assigning *ITS* duties for handling Claims to a 3rd Party, which is forbidden by law!

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION UNFAIR PRACTICES IN SETTLING CLAIMS; LIABILITY OF INSURER FOR DAMAGES (NRS 686A.310)

- 8. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- 9. PLAINTIFF and DEFENDANT entered into a valid, enforceable insurance contract (hereinafter "the Policy") that included Coverage for Personal Property Loss with a \$225,000 Liability Limit.
- 10. PLAINTIFF suffered a MOST **EGREGIOUS**, *HORRIFIC*, **CATASTROPHIC** and **LIFE-ALTERING THEFT** of **ALL** his personal property, with the exception of the clothes that I was wearing and said loss is a covered Peril of the Policy.
- 11. THE **ACTUAL VALUE** of my **STOLEN** PERSONAL PROPERTY was **over \$500,000** and this was **ALL** the PERSONAL PROPERTY that I had **ACQUIRED** for over the **62+ years** of my life and **ALL** I had LEFT was the clothes that I was wearing and that my SAFE containing **ALL** the receipts and/or documentation of the **over \$500,000** of

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 20 OF 69

PERSONAL PROPERTY that I HAD ACQUIRED for over the **62+ years** of my life WAS **TAKEN** as well.

- 12. PLAINTIFF FILED his CLAIM with DEFENDANT on or about 11 JULY 2022.
- 13. PLAINTIFF has provided to DEFENDANT said PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION to establish DEFENDANT's liability to pay on this Claim. The required said PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION was RECEIVED by DEFENDANT on or about 25 JULY 2022.
- 14. PLAINTIFF has communicated with DEFENDANT via **25+** voicemails and emails regarding this Claim and **N0 0NE** from DEFENDANT's Claims Department has EVER contacted me.
- 15. DEFENDANT engaged in the following activities that are considered to be unfair practice under NRS §686A.310, Subsection I:
  - a. failing to acknowledge or act reasonably promptly upon communication with respect to claims arising under insurance policy: it has been almost 2 months since I initially filed this Claim on or about 11 July 2022 and N0 ONE from DEFENDANT's Claims Department has EVER contacted me;
  - b. failing to affirm or deny coverage of claims within a reasonable time (30 working days-NAC §686A.675) after proof of loss requirements have been completed and submitted by the insured: sald PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION were completed and received by DEFENDANT on or about 25 JULY 2022;
  - c. failing effectuate prompt, fair and equitable settlements of claims in which liability of INSURER has become reasonably clear: this Claim was a result of THEFT, a covered loss peril, the proof of loss requirements were completed **on**

or about 25 JULY 2022, and NAC §686A.675 requires ANY WRITTEN ACCEPTANCE OR DENIAL OF HIS CLAIM WITHIN 30 WORKING DAYS or 6 September 2022;

- d. compelling insureds to institute litigation to recover amounts due under the insurance policy: since you are reading this Complaint, I was obviously compelled to institute litigation in order to recover the amount to which I am legally entitled under the Policy: PLAINTIFF instituted Case No.: 2:22-cv-1451-GMN-BNW in the U.S. District Court for District of NEVADA on 6 SEPTEMBER 2022;
- e. failing to settle claims promptly when liability has become reasonably clear under one portion of the insurance policy coverage: see above;
- f. failing to provide promptly to an insured a reasonable explanation of the basis in the insurance policy with respect to the facts of the insurer's claim and applicable law: it has been almost 6 MONTHS since I initially filed this Claim on or about 11 July 2022 and NO ONE from DEFENDANT's Claims Department has EVER contacted me.
- g. failing to adopt and implement reasonable standards for the prompt investigation and proceeding of claims arising under insurance policies: the fact that this incident occurred is prima facie evidence **establishing** that either none were adopted or their implementation was **INTENTIONALLY** ignored.
- 16. DEFENDANT's engagement in any one of the above unlawful activities establishes DEFENDANT's unfair practices regarding the Claim. The DEFENDANT has engaged in **SEVEN (7)** of these unlawful activities. NRS §686A.310.
- 17. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties of the parties to this action and further since that there is **NO ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW**, in that the PLAINTIFF contends that DEFENDANT failed to accept or deny the Claim within 30 working days after receipt of properly executed proofs of loss received by DEFENDANT on 25 July 2022 or by **6 September 2022** and DEFENDANT **MUST**, THEREFORE, **ACCEPT** Plaintiff's CLAIM as **PRESENTED/ESTABLISHED** to IT in **said**

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 2 OF 69

PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION and MUST PAY within 30 Calendar days of this failure.

- 18. In addition, DEFENDANT's failure was INTENTIONAL and with the knowledge that there was **NO** reasonable basis for **NOT** paying the claim.
- 19. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result DEFENDANT's activities, PLAINTIFF is entitled to **PROMPT PAYMENT** of **\$224,750** (\$225,000-\$250 Deductible) for **LOSS** of his PERSONAL PROPERTY by **THEFT**.
- 20. DEFENDANT's failure to pay the \$224,750 within 30 Calendar Days after 6
  SEPTEMBER 2022 OR by 6 OCTOBER 2022 entitles PLAINTIFF to interest on the
  \$224,750 at the rate of interest established pursuant to NRS §99.040. Interest must be calculated from the date on which the payment is due until the claim is paid. NAC §686A.675.
- 21. DEFENDANT's activities were committed with oppression and/or malice, entitling PLAINTIFF to Punitive Damages pursuant to NRS §42.005 in amount of between \$10,000,000 to \$35,000,000 as a means of deterring that these UNFAIR/UNLAWFUL CLAIMS PRACTICES NEVER HAPPEN AGAIN in the future.
- 22. Alternatively, Punitive Damages should be awarded each of the SEVEN (7) unlawful activities to which DEFENDANT engaged. For example, if I am awarded Punitive damages of \$5,000,000 then this is multiplied by 7 for a \$35,000,000 total award.

24

25

23

26 27

28

- 23. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of DEFENDANTS' acts, it has become necessary for ME, AS the 2ND COMING and an Attorney, to bring this law suit and thus, I AM ENTITLED to recover fees, INCLUDING ATTORNEY FEES, and costs incurred herein as damages.
- 24. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.
- 25. As set forth in Subsection II of NRS §686A.310, DEFENDANT is LIABLE to PLAINTIFF FOR ANY and ALL DAMAGES SUSTAINED by PLAINTIFF AS A RESULT of ENGAGING in any ONE of the activities set forth in Subsection I as an UNFAIR/ **UNLAWFUL CLAIMS PRACTICES:** 
  - a. BUT FOR the BAD FAITH and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT of CCIE in the handling and processing of my Claim for which they are legally liable and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired during 62+ years of my life leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name for which this claim still remains unprocessed and unpaid; I do not have the funds to purchase items that I see on eBay that were stolen from me. Instead, I am forced to watch these items get bought by others, such as family heirlooms and 1-of-a-kind/non-replaceable items, and my past life slowly disappear forever! Moreover I am forced to have ripped from me, my life's work (such as losing the only copy of my PhD Thesis), dreams and memories and have them replaced with EMOTIONAL SCARING!
  - b. BUT FOR the BAD FAITH and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT of CCIE in the handling and processing of my Claim for which they are legally liable and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired during 62+ years of my life leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name for which this claim still remains unprocessed and unpaid; I no longer have money for some place to stay and soon will become **DESTITUTE** and remain **HOMELESS!**

- c. BUT FOR the BAD FAITH and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT of *CCIE* in the handling and processing of my Claim for which they are legally liable and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired during 62+ years of my life leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name for which this claim still remains unprocessed and unpaid; I I am forced to be continually INFLICTED with emotional distress as well as NOT being able to afford to seek treatment for my ever-worsening emotional distress!
- d. BUT FOR the BAD FAITH and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT of CCIE in the handling and processing of my Claim for which they are legally liable and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired during 62+ years of my life leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name for which this claim still remains unprocessed and unpaid; I cannot afford to purchase suitable clothing to interview for employment and once employment is found to purchase suitable clothing for work!
- e. BUT FOR the BAD FAITH and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT of CCIE in the handling and processing of my Claim for which they are legally liable and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired during 62+ years of my life leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name for which this claim still remains unprocessed and unpaid; I cannot afford to bring legal action against the Landlord and San Francisco for their conduct and actions in this matter!
- f. BUT FOR the BAD FAITH and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT of CCIE in the handling and processing of my Claim for which they are legally liable and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired during 62+ years of my life leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name for which this claim still remains unprocessed and unpaid; I am denied access to my LIFE-GIVING CPAP machine, because without it, chances of me becoming Brain-dead from lack of oxygen while sleeping greatly increases every day and I cannot afford to purchase another one!

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

- - g. BUT FOR the BAD FAITH and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT of CCIE in the handling and processing of my Claim for which they are legally liable and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired during 62+ years of my life leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name for which this claim still remains unprocessed and unpaid; I am forced to live below the Federal-Poverty level and continue to be EMASCULATED as well as being DENIED Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of **Happiness** as set out in the **U.S. Constitution!**
  - h. BUT FOR the BAD FAITH and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT of CCIE in the handling and processing of my Claim for which they are legally liable and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired during 62+ years of my life leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name for which this claim still remains unprocessed and unpaid simply because I am the 2ND COMING and there are those among the human race that think that by denying me funding to begin my new life as the 2ND **COMING** that they will be "saved" from damnation!
- 26. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of DEFENDANT's, CCIE's, engaging in UNFAIR/UNLAWFUL CLAIMS PRACTICES while processing my Claim, PLAINTIFF is entitled to compensatory damages in the amount of at least \$1,000,000 or the amount determined at trial, exclusive of the amounts received above for its violation of Subsection I of NRS §686A.310.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION ABUSE, NEGLECT OR EXPLOITATION OF AN OLDER VULNERABLE PERSON

- 27. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- 28. At the time of the acts complained of herein, PLAINTIFF was 62, almost 63 years old.

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE OF 69

29. At all times relevant hereto, PLAINTIFF was of the class of persons NRS §41.1395

30. At all times relevant hereto, PLAINTIFF was an "older" and/or "vulnerable" person

32. ON 6 JULY 2022, I suffered a MOST EGREGIOUS, HORRIFIC, CATASTROPHIC

was designed to protect.

as defined by NRS §41.1395.

violation of NRS §41.1395.

this **THEFT**.

and *LIFE-ALTERING* THEFT of ALL my personal property, with the exception of the clothes that I was wearing. Among the items stolen was my SAFE with all information regarding my personal property, such as the authentications for the autographed baseballs and all receipts of the originally-purchased items. THE *ACTUAL* VALUE of my STOLEN Personal Property was valued at over \$500,000 and that this was everything I acquired for over the 62+ years of my life. I NEVER authorized the removal of my personal property NOR was it abandoned. I also reported this THEFT to the San Francisco Police Department and received SFPD Incident Report #220447545 detailing

33. PLAINTIFF is entitled to **DOUBLE DAMAGES** pursuant to NRS §41.1395(1) OR \$224,750 X 2 = **\$445,000**.

34. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of **said SCHEME**, PLAINTIFF has been damaged in excess of \$75,000, and in an amount to be determined at the time of the trial OR  $$224,750 \times 2 = $445,000$ .

PAGE 27 OF 69

future.
EXPLOITATION OF AN OLDER VULNERABLE PERSON from EVER HAPPENING AGAIN in the
\$10,000,000 to \$35,000,000 as a means of deterring that THIS <b>ABUSE</b> , <b>NEGLECT OR</b>
PLAINTIFF to Punitive Damages pursuant to NRS §42.005 in amount of between
35. DEFENDANT's activities were committed with oppression and/or malice, entitling

36. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of DEFENDANTS' acts, it has become necessary for **ME**, AS the 2ND COMING and an Attorney, to bring this law suit and thus, **I AM** ENTITLED to recover fees, INCLUDING ATTORNEY FEES, and costs incurred herein as damages.

# THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTIES

CARE, DISCLOSURE, ACCOUNTING, LOYALTY, GOOD FAITH & CONFIDENTIALITY

- 37. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- 38. DEFENDANT was at all times relevant hereto a Fiduciary to PLAINTIFF.
- 39. Use of call centers, as a mean to increase profits, would be considered a breach of fiduciary duties, most especially confidentiality. Call Centers, by their very nature, are a fraudulent organization that rely on deceiving the insured into believing they are employees of the Insurance Company and then using your Privacy Information to gain access to your CCIE account, i.e. PHISHING!! Insurance companies, like CCIE, are complicit in this deception by allowing the use of their Name to appear on Caller ID and identifying the call center employees as "REPRESENTATIVES." However, these

employees are not in a fiduciary relationship with the insured and so are not held to the same confidentiality, care and loyalty standards. Their use of deception coupled with CCIE's allowing use of your Private Information to allow this 3rd party to commit PHISHING and to get into your account information is paramount to a BREACH OF SECURITY.

- 40. Under Negligence Per Se, since DEFENDANT violated NRS §686A.310, the burden of proof shifts to IT to show excuse or justification for its negligence in breaching its fiduciary duties. Del Piero versus Phillips, 105 Nevada 48, 769 P.2d 53 (1989); Barnes versus Delta Lines, Incorporated, 99 Nevada 688, 669 P.2d 709 (1983).
- 41. DEFENDANT's use of call centers is a further breach of fiduciary duties, most especially confidentiality. Call Centers, by their very nature, are a fraudulent organization that rely on deceiving the insured into believing they are employees of the Insurance Company and then using your Privacy Information to gain access to your account, i.e. PHISHING!! Insurance companies, like CCIE, are complicit in this deception by allowing the use of their Name to appear on Caller ID and identifying the call center employees as "REPRESENTATIVES." However, these employees are not in a fiduciary relationship with the insured and so are not held to the same confidentiality, care and loyalty standards. Their use of deception coupled with CCIE's allowing use of your Private Information to allow this 3rd party to commit PHISHING and to HACK into your account information is paramount to a BREACH OF SECURITY.
- 42. DEFENDANT's breach of its fiduciary duties was deliberate.

1
l

27

28

44. BUT FOR the BAD FAITH and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT of CCIE and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired

43. DEFENDANT knew or recklessly disregarded the fact that there was no

during 62+ years of my life for which I have yet to been compensated:

reasonable basis for not paying the claim.

- a. I do not have the funds to purchase items that I see on eBay that were stolen from me. Instead, I am forced to watch these items get bought by others, such as family heirlooms and 1-of-a-kind/non-replaceable items, and my past life slowly disappear forever! Moreover I am forced to have ripped from me, my life's work (such as losing the only copy of my PhD Thesis), dreams and memories and have them replaced with EMOTIONAL SCARING!
- b. I no longer have money for some place to stay and soon will become **DESTITUTE** and remain **HOMELESS!**
- c. I am forced to be continually INFLICTED with emotional distress as well as NOT being able to afford to seek treatment for my ever-worsening emotional distress!
- d. I cannot afford to purchase suitable clothing to interview for employment and once employment is found to purchase suitable clothing for work!
- e. I cannot afford to bring legal action against the Landlord and San Francisco for their conduct and actions in this matter!
- f. I am denied access to my LIFE-GIVING CPAP machine, because without it, chances of me becoming Brain-dead from lack of oxygen while sleeping greatly increases every day and I cannot afford to purchase another one!
- g. I am forced to live below the Federal-Poverty level and continue to be EMASCULATED as well as being DENIED Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness as set out in the U.S. Constitution!

- h. This Claim still remains unprocessed and unpaid simply because I am the **2nd Coming** and there are those among the human race that think that by denying me funding to begin my new life as the **2ND COMING** that they will be "saved" from damnation!
- 45. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of DEFENDANT engaging in unlawful practices while processing this Claim, PLAINTIFF has been damaged in excess of \$75,000, and in an amount to be determined at the time of the trial.
- 46. DEFENDANT's activities were committed with oppression and/or malice, entitling PLAINTIFF to Punitive Damages pursuant to **NRS §42.005** in amount of between \$10,000,000 to \$35,000,000 as a means of deterring that these **BREACHES OF FIDUCIARY DUTIES NEVER HAPPENING AGAIN** in the future. NRS §42.001 and §42.005.

# FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION ABUSE OF PROCESS

- 47. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- 48. PLAINTIFF filed a lawsuit captioned DR. TRUST JUSTICE "TJ" TRUTH, ESQUIRE v. CALIFORNIA CASUALTY INDEMNITY EXCHANGE (THE), Case No. 22:2-cv-01451-GMN-BNW in the United States District Court for the State of Nevada (hereinafter "said LAWSUIT").
- 49. After filing said LAWSUIT, DEFENDANTS committed at least one WILLFUL ACT in THEIR use of the legal process. Each willful act was IMPROPER IN THE REGULAR CONDUCT of the PROCEEDINGS of said LAWSUIT.
- 50. Each willful act was committed for an ulterior purpose other than to resolve this dispute.

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE PAGE 3 OF 69

27

28

51. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of Scheme, PLAINTIFF has been damaged in excess of \$75,000, and in an amount to be determined at the time of the trial.

52. DEFENDANT's activities were committed with oppression and/or malice, entitling PLAINTIFF to Punitive Damages pursuant to NRS §42.005 in amount of between \$10,000,000 to \$35,000,000 as a means of deterring that THIS ABUSE of PROCESS NEVER HAPPEN AGAIN in the future. NRS §42.001 and §42.005

53. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of DEFENDANTS' acts, it has become necessary for ME, AS the 2ND COMING and an Attorney, to bring this law suit and thus. I AM ENTITLED to recover fees, INCLUDING ATTORNEY FEES, and costs incurred herein as damages.

## **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS**

These DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS are NECESSITATED BY THE FACT that CCIE believes IT is ABOVE THE LAW through the USE of LOOPHOLES in our JUDICIAL SYSTEM to CIRCUMVENT THESE LAWS and NOT pay on ITS CLAIMS to which IT is LEGALLY OBLIGATED to pay. INSTEAD IT relies on HARASSMENT and DELAY TACTICS to wear down the CLAIMANT into GIVING UP! ACCORDINGLY the following DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS are needed TO PLUG THESE LOOPHOLES and TO PREVENT this from **EVER HAPPENING AGAIN** by CCIE and ALL Other Insurance Companies that have CENTRALIZED their Insurance Operations and use UNFAIR/UNLAWFUL CLAIMS **PRACTICES:** 

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 32 OF 69

54. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the

22 23

24

25

2627

28

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT #
------------------------

allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein. 55. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties of the parties to this action and further since that there is NO ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW, in that the PLAINTIFF contends that when NRS §686A.310 (SEE EXHIBIT K) and NAC §686A.675 (SEE EXHIBIT L) are read together they STIPULATE that an Insurance Company, i.e., CCIE, has 30 "WORKING" DAYS after RECEIPT OF said PROPERLY **EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION** by ITS CLAIMS DEPARTMENT for the Claim's Adjustor/Estimator to MAKE a DETERMINATION as to whether TO ACCEPT, **DENY or REQUEST MORE TIME** regarding THIS CLAIM. THIS DETERMINATION or REQUEST MUST IN WRITING to PLAINTIFF. ANY WRITTEN REQUEST FOR MORE TIME is limited to 30 Days and MUST INCLUDE THE REASONS WHY MORE TIME IS NEEDED and where said Insurance Company FAILS TO PROVIDE to PLAINTIFF with a WRITTEN ACCEPTANCE OR DENIAL OF HIS CLAIM OF A WRITTEN REQUEST WITH THE **REASONS MORE TIME IS NEEDED** WITHIN said 30 WORKING DAYS:

- a. IT is **ESTOPPED** from any FURTHER inquiries regarding this matter as IT has been provided adequate time to make THIS DETERMINATION,
- b. IT MUST, THEREFORE, ACCEPT Plaintiff's CLAIM as PRESENTED/ESTABLISHED to IT in said PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION, and

c. IT MUST, THEREFORE, PROCESS and OFFER a SETTLEMENT PAYMENT BASED ON ALL the **PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION**, including any UPDATES, that ITS CLAIMS DEPARTMENT RECEIVED.

56. ACCORDINGLY, DEFENDANT MUST PROMPTLY PAY PLAINTIFF \$224,750 (\$225,000-\$250 Deductible) as well as ANY INTEREST to which PLAINTIFF is entitled at the rate established pursuant to NRS §99.040 for failure to pay PLAINTIFF by 6 OCTOBER 2022 pursuant to NAC §686A.675 (1) (SEE EXHIBIT L).

### **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT #2**

- 57. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- 58. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties of the parties to this action and further since that there is NO ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW, in that the PLAINTIFF contends that:
- a. ON 25 JULY 2022, DEFENDANT RECEIVED the PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION,
- b. said PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION was sufficient for DEFENDANT to make a DETERMINATION as to whether TO ACCEPT, DENY or REQUEST MORE TIME regarding THIS CLAIM,
- c. 30 WORKING DAYS TRANSPIRED since CCIE RECEIVED said PROPERLY EXECUTED PROOF OF LOSS DOCUMENTATION, and

d. DEFENDANT **FAILED** by **6 September 2022 TO PROVIDE** to PLAINTIFF A

WRITTEN ACCEPTANCE OR DENIAL OF HIS CLAIM or A WRITTEN REQUEST WITH

THE REASONS MORE TIME IS NEEDED.

59. ACCORDINGLY, DEFENDANTS **MUST PROMPTLY PAY** PLAINTIFF **\$224,750** (\$225,000-\$250 Deductible) as well as ANY INTEREST to which PLAINTIFF is entitled at the rate established pursuant to NRS §99.040 for failure to pay PLAINTIFF **by 6 OCTOBER 2022** pursuant to NAC §686A.675 (1) (SEE **EXHIBIT L**).

### **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT #3**

60. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.

61. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties of the parties to this action and further since that there is NO ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW, in that the PLAINTIFF contends that as set forth in Subsection II of NRS §686A.310, DEFENDANT is LIABLE to PLAINTIFF for ANY and ALL DAMAGES SUSTAINED by PLAINTIFF as a DIRECT, PROXIMATE and FORESEEABLE RESULT of ENGAGING in any ONE of the ACTIVITIES set forth in Subsection I of NRS §686A.310 as UNFAIR/UNLAWFUL CLAIMS PRACTICES. FURTHERMORE, THIS COURT has continually stated that there is a SPECIAL FIDUCIARY RELATIONSHIP between the insured and the insurer, especially since the insured buys insurance for SECURITY, PROTECTION and PEACE OF MIND. IN ADDITION, the FACTS CLEARLY establish and support a finding that CCIE and said BAD APPLE acted RECKLESSLY and OPPRESSIVELY, KNOWING that there was NO REASONABLE BASIS for DENYING

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 350F 69

THIS CLAIM and were using UNFAIR/UNLAWFUL CLAIMS PRACTICES TO AVOID paying this CLAIM.

62. ACCORDINGLY, PLAINTIFF is **ENTITLED** to compensatory damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) as well as ANY INTEREST to which PLAINTIFF is entitled.

### **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT #4**

- 63. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- 64. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties of the parties to this action and further since that there is NO ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW, in that the PLAINTIFF contends that as defined, **THEFT**, includes **REMOVAL** of my **PERSONAL PROPERTY** from MY RENTAL, by a person other than myself, without my **EXPRESSED WRITTEN PERMISSION** and is a **COVERED LOSS PERIL** under my policy **WITH CCIE**.
- 65. ACCORDINGLY, the **REMOVAL** of ALL my PERSONAL PROPERTY with the except of the clothes I was wearing, WHICH I **DISCOVERED** ON **6 JULY 2022**, is a **COVERED** LOSS PERIL under my policy WITH CCIE and I am ENTITLED to **PROMPT** PAYMENT of \$224,750 (\$225,000-\$250 Deductible) as well as ANY INTEREST to which PLAINTIFF is entitled at the rate established pursuant to NRS §99.040 for DEFENDANT's failure to pay PLAINTIFF by **6 OCTOBER 2022** pursuant to NAC §686A.675 (1) (SEE EXHIBIT L).

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 36 OF 69

**DECLARATORY JUDGMENT #5** 

of the parties to this action and further since that there is NO ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW, in that the PLAINTIFF contends that this is a MOST **EGREGIOUS**, *HORRIFIC*, **CATASTROPHIC** and *LIFE-ALTERING* THEFT of ALL my personal property, with the

67. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties

66. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the

allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.

with ALL THE INFORMATION regarding my personal property, such as ALL the authentications for the autographed baseballs and ALL the receipts of the originally-purchased items. My **STOLEN** Personal Property was valued at **over \$500,000** and

exception of the clothes that I was wearing. Among the items STOLEN was my SAFE

that this was everything I acquired for over the **62+ years** of my life. THUS, it would be

UNCONSCIONABLE for me to be required TO REPLACE ALL of these items AT AGE
62, especially since the ACTUAL LOSS is GREATER than the POLICY's Personal
Property Loss Liability Limits of \$225,000. Instead the entire Claim of \$225,500 should
be paid out so that I can use these funds to rebuild some semblance of my life that had

been **RIPPED** from me!

68. ACCORDINGLY,, DEFENDANTS **MUST PROMPTLY PAY** PLAINTIFF **\$224,750** (\$225,000-\$250 Deductible) as well as ANY INTEREST to which PLAINTIFF is entitled at the rate established pursuant to NRS §99.040 for failure to pay PLAINTIFF **by 6 OCTOBER 2022** pursuant to NAC §686A.675 (1) (SEE **EXHIBIT L**).

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 37 OF 69

13

69. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.

70. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties of the parties to this action and further since that there is NO ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW, in that the PLAINTIFF contends that due to the fact that an UNFAIR/UNLAWFUL CLAIMS PRACTICE Cause of Action revolves around the INSURED'S CLAIMS LOG because of the STATUTORY REQUIREMENT that ALL ACCEPTANCE and DENIALS of a CLAIM MUST BE IN WRITING and NOTATED IN said CLAIM LOG and FURTHER SINCE ANY REQUESTS FOR ADDITION TIME MUST ALSO BE IN WRITING and AGAIN NOTATED IN said INSURED'S CLAIM LOG as well as there being a FIDUCIARY DUTY by said INSURER TO DISCLOSE and to render an ACCOUNTING to said INSURED; any time said INSURER accepts a claim for LESS THAN what the INSURED REQUESTED OR DENIES ANY PART of said INSURED'S Claim, Requires More Time OR said INSURED is FORCED TO INSTITUTE A LAWSUIT FOR UNFAIR/UNLAWFUL CLAIMS PRACTICES; said INSURER MUST IMMEDIATELY PROVIDE said INSURED with a CERTIFIED COPY of said INSURED'S CLAIM LOG regarding INSURED's CLAIM!

71. ACCORDINGLY, DEFENDANT, CCIE, MUST IMMEDIATELY PROVIDE PLAINTIFF with a CERTIFIED COPY of his CLAIM LOG regarding PLAINTIFF's CLAIM!

#### **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT #7**

- 72. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- 73. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties of the parties to this action and further since that there is NO ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW, in that the PLAINTIFF contends that as defined, **THEFT**, includes **REMOVAL** of my **PERSONAL PROPERTY** from MY RENTAL, by a person other than myself, without my **EXPRESSED WRITTEN PERMISSION** and is a **COVERED LOSS PERIL** under my policy **WITH CCIE**.
- 74. ALL CLAIM-RELATED matters **MUST** be handled by the INSURER and can NOT be transferred/handled by any 3rd Party, including LAW FIRMS, as this is a BREACH OF CONTRACT and against Code of Regulations regarding how INSURANCE COMPANIES handle THEIR CLAIMS. The INSURER is ABSOLUTELY REQUIRED to NOTATE/DOCUMENT ALL CORRESPONDENCE regarding this CLAIM, including telephone calls, in the CLAIM LOG for this CLAIM.
- 75. FURTHERMORE, ALL MATTERS handled by NON-INSURERs, including LAW FIRMS, MUST be STRUCK for the COURT RECORD for VIOLATION of the above-mentioned BREACH BREACH OF CONTRACT and against Code of Regulations regarding how INSURANCE COMPANIES handle THEIR CLAIMS.
- 76. ACCORDINGLY, DEFENDANT, CCIE (OR CCMC), MUST IMMEDIATELY

  TERMINATE ITS relationship with LLP regarding PLAINTIFF's CLAIM!

16

18

22

24

26 27

28

#### **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT #8**

77. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.

78. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties

- of the parties to this action and further since that there is NO ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW, in that the PLAINTIFF contends that the use of Call Center "representatives" would be akin to assigning ITS duties for handling Claims to a 3rd Party, which is forbidden by law, a BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTIES, most especially confidentiality since CALL CENTERS are by their very nature, organizations that rely on deceiving the caller into believing they are employees of that Insurance Company in order to obtain the caller's PPI TO GAIN access to caller's account, i.e., PHISHING as well as their use of deception, coupled with CCIE's allowing USE of your PPI, to allow this 3rd party, i.e., NON-CCIE EMPLOYEES and NON-STATE LICENSED INSURANCE Producers/ Agents/Brokers/Claim Estimators/Adjusters, to commit PHISHING and to HACK into YOUR ACCOUNT INFORMATION is PARAMOUNT to a BREACH OF SECURITY.
- 79. ACCORDINGLY, DEFENDANT needs to IMMEDIATELY DISCONTINUE use of and be **PERMANENTLY ENJOINED** from using Call Center "representatives"! **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT #9**
- 80. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- 81. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties of the parties to this action and further since that there is NO ADEQUATE REMEDY AT

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 40 OF 69

LAW, in that because of CCIE's UNFAIR/UNLAWFUL CLAIM PRACTICES that IT be ESTOPPED from SUBROGATION to get ITS money back if I am able to sue the landlord and am awarded FULL DAMAGES for the **THEFT** of MY Personal Property as CCIE should **NOT** BENEFIT because of ITS UNFAIR/UNLAWFUL CLAIMS PRACTICE and UNCLEAN HANDS.

82. ACCORDINGLY, CCIE is PERMANENTLY ENJOINED from any FUTURE SUBROGATION of any CLAIMS or AWARDED DAMAGES relating to this CASE and its UNDERLYING LOSS.

#### ADDITIONALLY FOR ALL DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

- 83. DEFENDANT, CCIE, be **ENJOINED** from ACCEPTING, SUBMITTING and/or ISSUING any new policies regardless of the type of insurance UNTIL IT has COMPLETELY OVERHAULED ITS CLAIMS DEPARTMENT AND CLAIM PROCESSING AND HANDLING to:
- a. DECENTRALIZE IT and reopen LOCAL OFFICES IN ALL STATES WHERE IT SELLS INSURANCE in accordance with current state laws,
- b. STAFF ITS Local Offices with State-Licensed Producers, Brokers, Claim Adjusters/Estimators, etc. in accordance with current state laws,
  - c. DISCONTINUE use of a DEFECTIVE said BAD BOT,
- d. REINTRODUCE INDIVIDUAL FILES AND CLAIM LOGS in accordance with current state laws, and
- e. FULLY process and paid out on all ITS claims CURRENTLY being handled and processed-Starting with mine in accordance with current state laws!!!!

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 41 OF 69

84. Force DEFENDANT to sent an APOLOGY LETTER, via U.S. Mail and electronically, to all Policyholders and to Publish same on its Website and in all local newspapers regarding the non-payment of this Claim and this lawsuit and what measures they are taking to make sure this **NEVER HAPPENS AGAIN** and to conduct its business as set out in its CODE!

85. Said BAD APPLE should pay out of her own personal funds the Punitive Damages in addition to those for Negligent/Intentional Infliction of Emotion Distress!

ALTERNATIVELY, said BAD APPLE should have to do 10,000 hours of COMMUNITY SERVICE!

### SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- 86. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- 87. Under Negligence Per Se, since DEFENDANT violated NRS §686A.310 and NAC §686A.675, the **burden of proof SHIFTS to IT** to show excuse or justification for its negligent **inflicting** of emotional distress to PLAINTIFF. Del Piero versus Phillips, 105 Nevada 48, 769 P.2d 53 (1989); Barnes versus Delta Lines, Incorporated, 99 Nevada 688, 669 P.2d 709 (1983).
- 88. DEFENDANT's conduct would have been the actual or proximate cause for PLAINTIFF to suffer emotional distress.
- 89. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result DEFENDANT's conduct, PLAINTIFF is entitled to damages in amount of between \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000.

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 42 OF 69

3 4

> 5 6

> > 7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

28

### SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- 90. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- 91. DEFENDANT acted in extreme and outrageous conduct with either the intention of, or reckless disregard for, causing emotional distress to PLAINTIFF.
- 92. DEFENDANT's conduct would have been the actual or proximate cause for PLAINTIFF to suffer emotional distress.
- 93. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result DEFENDANT's conduct, PLAINTIFF is entitled to damages in amount of between \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000.

### SPECIAL PLEADING, e.g., FRAUD

### **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION CIVIL LIABILITY FOR HATE CRIME (NRS §41.690)**

- 94. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- 95. PLAINTIFF suffered injury as the PROXIMATE RESULT of DEFENDANTS'
- WILLFUL VIOLATION of at least one crime including §200.5099 and §200.571.
- 96. DEFENDANT's ACTS were motivated by a desire target PLAINTIFF'S ACTUAL or
- PERCEIVED race, color, RELIGION as the 2ND COMING, national origin, physical or mental disability or sexual orientation.

20 21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

97. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of DEFENDANT's ACTS, PLAINTIFF has been damaged in the amount of at least TWO Hundred and Twenty-four Thousand, Seven Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$224,750). Although this amount may be INCREASED at the time of the trial.

98. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of DEFENDANT's ACTS, PLAINTIFF has been damaged in an additional amount for compensatory damages in an amount at least ONE Million Dollars (\$1,000,000). Although this amount may be INCREASED at the time of the trial.

99. DEFENDANT's ACTS were committed with fraud, oppression, and/or malice, entitling PLAINTIFF to PUNITIVE DAMAGES pursuant to NRS §42.005 and as these **ACTS PERPETRATE CCIE**'s **UNFAIR/UNLAWFUL CLAIM PRACTICES** the "limitations on the amount of an award of exemplary PUNITIVE DAMAGES in subsection 1 do NOT apply..." AS such PLAINTIFF is entitled to an amount of at least \$50,000,000 as a means of deterring that THESE ACTS will EVER HAPPEN AGAIN. Although these amounts may be INCREASED at the time of the trial.

100. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of DEFENDANT's ACTS, it has become necessary for ME, AS the 2ND COMING and an Attorney, to bring THIS lawsuit and THUS, I AM ENTITLED to recover fees, INCLUDING ATTORNEY FEES, and costs incurred herein as damages.

PAGE 44 OF 69

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

### 101. NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION WRIT OF MANDAMUS

- a. PLAINTIFF repeats, realleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations hereinabove inclusively as though set forth at length and in full herein.
- b. The United States District Court for the District of Nevada acted arbitrarily and capriciously by failing to:
  - 1) ENTER a DEFAULT JUDGMENT against *CCIE* as REQUIRED by Rule 55(b) (1);
  - 2) HOLD a "PROVE-UP" HEARING and ENTER a DEFAULT JUDGMENT against CCIE as REQUIRED by Rule 55(b)(2);
  - 3) CONSIDER the PLAINTIFF'S MOTION for SUMMARY JUDGMENT against *CCIE* and ORDER a SUMMARY JUDGMENT against *CCIE* as REQUIRED by Rule 56;
  - 4) CONSIDER the PLAINTIFF'S MOTION for SANCTIONS for VIOLATION of RULE 11 of the F.R.C.P. and N.R.C.P. and ISSUES SANCTIONS against CCIE, through ITS Attorneys, as well as STRIKING all of DEFENDANT'S FILED-PLEADINGS, including, but NOT limited to, ITS "ANSWER" AND DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION for DEFAULT and SUMMARY JUDGMENTS;
  - 5) GRANT and CONDUCT RULE 57 "SPEEDY HEARINGS" for PLAINTIFF's PLED Declaratory Relief;
  - 6) DETERMINE IF WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER LLP Law Firm (hereinafter "LLP") had **LEGAL** AUTHORIZATION from a CCIE EMPLOYEE or CORPORATE OFFICER **LEGALLY** QUALIFIED to ENTER into a CONTRACTUAL RELATION with IT; and

PAGE 450F 69

7) DETERMINE IF the TAINT of LLP's FRAUD UPON THE COURT rendered THIS
COURT incapable of <b>CONTINUING</b> with THIS CASE because of <b>ACTUAL</b> /
IMPLIED BIAS of the JUDGES against PLAINTIFF and in favor of CCIE, through IT
Attorneys, in violation of 28 U.S. Code §455, 28 U.S. Code §144 and/or NRS
§1.235.

- c. The United States District Court for the District of Nevada's arbitrary and capricious actions justify this Court's issuance of a WRIT OF MANDAMUS directing the United States District Court for the District of Nevada to take the following actions:
  - 1) ENTER a DEFAULT JUDGMENT against *CCIE* as REQUIRED by Rule 55(b) (1);
  - 2) HOLD a "PROVE-UP" HEARING and ENTER a DEFAULT JUDGMENT against CCIE as REQUIRED by Rule 55(b)(2);
  - 3) CONSIDER the PLAINTIFF'S MOTION for SUMMARY JUDGMENT against *CCIE* and ORDER a SUMMARY JUDGMENT against *CCIE* as REQUIRED by Rule 56;
  - 4) CONSIDER the PLAINTIFF'S MOTION for SANCTIONS for VIOLATION of RULE 11 of the F.R.C.P. and N.R.C.P. and ISSUES SANCTIONS against CCIE, through ITS Attorneys, as well as STRIKING all of DEFENDANT'S FILED-PLEADINGS, including, but NOT limited to, ITS "ANSWER" AND DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION for DEFAULT and SUMMARY JUDGMENTS;
  - 5) GRANT and CONDUCT RULE 57 "SPEEDY HEARINGS" for PLAINTIFF's PLED Declaratory Relief;
  - 6) DETERMINE IF WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER LLP Law Firm (hereinafter "LLP") had **LEGAL AUTHORIZATION** from a CCIE

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 46 OF 69

EMPLOYEE or CORPORATE OFFICER *LEGALLY* **QUALIFIED** to ENTER into a CONTRACTUAL RELATION with *IT*; and

7) DETERMINE IF the **TAINT** of LLP's **FRAUD UPON THE COURT** rendered THIS COURT incapable of **CONTINUING** with THIS CASE because of **ACTUAL/IMPLIED BIAS** of the **JUDGES** against PLAINTIFF and in favor of *CCIE*, through *ITS* Attorneys, in violation of 28 U.S. Code §455, 28 U.S. Code §144 and/or NRS §1.235.

#### **PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for relief as follows:

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION UNFAIR PRACTICES IN SETTLING CLAIMS; LIABILITY OF INSURER FOR DAMAGES

- 1. For General Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of Two Hundred and Twenty-four Thousand, Seven Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$224,750).
- 2. For Compensatory Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of ONE Million Dollars (\$1,000,000).
- 3. For Punitive Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of TEN Million Dollars (\$10,000,000)
  - 4. For reasonable attorney's fees and cost expended in this action.
  - 5. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION ABUSE, NEGLECT OR EXPLOITATION OF AN OLDER VULNERABLE PERSON

- 1. For General Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of FOUR Hundred and Forty-five Thousand Dollars (\$445,000).
- 2. For Punitive Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of TEN Million Dollars (\$10,000,000).
  - 3. For reasonable attorney's fees and cost expended in this action.
  - 4. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTIES

- 1. For General Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE Thousand Dollars (\$75,000).
- 2. For Punitive Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of TEN Million Dollars (\$10,000,000)
  - 3. For reasonable attorney's fees and cost expended in this action.
- 4. Enjoin DEFENDANT from selling any more Insurance Polices for BREACH of Fiduciary Duties, especially Confidentiality and Privacy, as well as for a SECURITY BREACH OF PERSONAL PRIVATE INFORMATION that **must** be remedied by **discontinuing** the use of 3rd-Party Call Centers to increase their Profits and to conduct its business as set out in its CODE!
  - 5. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 48 OF 69

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION ABUSE OF PROCESS

1. For General Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE Thousand Dollars (\$75,000).

- 2. For Punitive Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of TEN Million Dollars (\$10,000,000)
  - 3. For reasonable attorney's fees and cost expended in this action.
  - 4. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS

- For general damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of Two Hundred and Twenty-four Thousand, Seven Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$224,750).
- 2. For compensatory damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000).
- 3. DEFENDANT, CCIE, be ENJOINED from ACCEPTING, SUBMITTING and/or ISSUING any new policies regardless of the type of insurance UNTIL IT has COMPLETELY OVERHAULED ITS CLAIMS DEPARTMENT AND CLAIM PROCESSING AND HANDLING to:
  - a. DECENTRALIZE IT and reopen LOCAL OFFICES IN ALL STATES WHERE IT SELLS INSURANCE,
  - b. STAFF ITS Local Offices with State-Licensed Producers, Brokers, Claim Adjusters/Estimators, etc.,

PAGE 49 OF 69

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

- c. DISCONTINUE use of a DEFECTIVE said BAD BOT,
- d. REINTRODUCE INDIVIDUAL FILES AND CLAIM LOGS, AND
- e. FULLY process and paid out on all ITS claims CURRENTLY being handled and processed-Starting with mine!!!!
- 4. Force DEFENDANT to sent an APOLOGY LETTER, via U.S. Mail and electronically, to all Policyholders and to Publish same on its Website and in all local newspapers regarding the non-payment of this Claim and this lawsuit and what measures they are taking to make sure this **NEVER HAPPENS AGAIN** and to conduct its business as set out in its CODE!
- 5. Said BAD APPLE should pay out of her own personal funds the Punitive Damages in addition to those for Negligent/Intentional Infliction of Emotion Distress.
- ALTERNATIVELY, said BAD APPLE should have to do 10,000 hours of COMMUNITY SERVICE!
- 6. For reasonable attorney's fees and cost expended in this action.
- 7. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

### SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- 1. For Damages awarded to PLAINTIFF in amount of between \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 for Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress and/or Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress as a direct, proximate and foreseeable result DEFENDANT's conduct!
  - 2. For reasonable attorney's fees and cost expended in this action.
- 3. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

### SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

For Damages awarded to PLAINTIFF in amount of between \$5,000,000 to

\$10,000,000 for Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress and/or Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress as a direct, proximate and foreseeable result DEFENDANT's conduct!

- 2. For reasonable attorney's fees and cost expended in this action.
- 3. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

### EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION CIVIL LIABILITY FOR HATE CRIME (NRS §41.690)

- For General Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of Two Hundred and Twenty-four Thousand, Seven Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$224,750) .
- 2. For Compensatory Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of ONE Million Dollars (\$1,000,000).
- 3. For Punitive Damages against DEFENDANT in an amount in excess of FIFTY Million Dollars (\$50,000,000)
  - 4. For reasonable attorney's fees and cost expended in this action.
  - 5. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

PAGE 51 OF 69

### NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION WRIT OF MANDAMUS

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada's arbitrary and capricious actions justify THIS Court's issuance of a WRIT OF MANDAMUS directing the United States District Court for the District of Nevada to take the following actions:

- 1. ENTER a DEFAULT JUDGMENT against CCIE as REQUIRED by Rule 55(b)(1);
- 2. HOLD a "PROVE-UP" HEARING and ENTER a DEFAULT JUDGMENT against CCIE as REQUIRED by Rule 55(b)(2);
- 3. CONSIDER the PLAINTIFF'S MOTION for SUMMARY JUDGMENT against CCIE and ORDER a SUMMARY JUDGMENT against CCIE as REQUIRED by Rule 56;
- 4. CONSIDER the PLAINTIFF'S MOTION for SANCTIONS for VIOLATION of RULE 11 of the F.R.C.P. and N.R.C.P. and ISSUES SANCTIONS against *CCIE*, through ITS Attorneys, as well as STRIKING all of DEFENDANT'S FILED-PLEADINGS, including, but NOT limited to, *ITS* "ANSWER" AND DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION for DEFAULT and SUMMARY JUDGMENTS;
- 5. GRANT and CONDUCT RULE 57 "SPEEDY HEARINGS" for PLAINTIFF's PLED Declaratory Relief;
- 6. DETERMINE IF WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER LLP Law Firm (hereinafter "LLP") had **LEGAL AUTHORIZATION** from a CCIE EMPLOYEE or CORPORATE OFFICER **LEGALLY QUALIFIED** to ENTER into a CONTRACTUAL RELATION with IT; and
- 7. DETERMINE IF the **TAINT** of LLP's **FRAUD UPON THE COURT** rendered THIS COURT incapable of **CONTINUING** with THIS CASE because of **ACTUAL/IMPLIED BIAS of the**

**JUDGES** against PLAINTIFF and in favor of CCIE, through ITS Attorneys, in violation of 28 U.S. Code §455, 28 U.S. Code §144 and/or NRS §1.235.

#### <u>INTEREST</u>

PLAINTIFF maintains the Right to Contractual Interest Rate if said Rate is GREATER THAN Statutory or Judgement Interest Rate.

### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLAINTIFF demands a JURY TRIAL for ALL of the above Causes of Actions and for determining DAMAGE Awards, such as PUNITIVE DAMAGES, as well as TO EXPOSE THIS WRONG TO THE WORLD!

PAGE 53 OF 69

#### **CERTIFICATION AND CLOSING**

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information and belief that this complaint: (1) is not being presented for an improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay or needlessly increase the cost of litigation; (2) is supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying or reversing existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with requirements of Rule 11.

I agree to provide the clerk's office with any changes to my address where case's last related papers may be served understand that my failure to keep a current address on file with the clerk's office may result in the dismissal of my casel agree to provide the clerk's office with any changes to my address where case's last related papers may be served understand that my failure to keep a current address on file with the clerk's office may result in the dismissal of my case.

Date of signing: 13 FEBRUARY 2023

Signature of Plaintiff:

DR. TRUST JUSTICE "TJ" TRUTH, ESQUIRE

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE SH OF 69

**INDEX OF EXHIBITS EXHIBIT A-THECODE EXHIBIT B-WELCOMELETTER EXHIBIT C**-HOMEOWNERS4POLICY-RENTERSDECLARATIONSPAGEAMENDED **EXHIBIT D-HOMEOWNERS4LossReportForm EXHIBIT E**-SFPDRPT-3 pages **EXHIBIT F-UPDATEDLOSSRPT EXHIBIT G**-*UPDATEDPPLOSSSCH*-5 pages **EXHIBIT H-**TYPICALEMAIL-2 pages **EXHIBIT I-SUMMONS EXHIBIT J-**ELECTRONIC FILING NOTICE OF SUMMONS ISSUED TO DEFENDANT EXHIBIT K-NRS §686A.310-2 pages **EXHIBIT L-NAC §686A.675 EXHIBIT M**-NAC §686A.670 EXHIBIT N-NAC §686A.665 

#### THE CALIFORNIA CASUALTY CODE

### WE ARE IN THE BUSINESS TO PROVIDE SERVICE!!

Our goal is to provide the HIGHEST quality of service and protection at a reasonable price, commensurate with FULFILLING OUR FINANCIAL OBLIGATION to our *POLICYHOLDERS*, employees, stockholders and claimants.

We **MUST** operate with **COMPLETE HONESTY** both moral and financial.

We should offer our services **only** to those who are likely to measure up to our standards of quality on a **long term basis**.

We should provide **our CUSTOMERS** with broad modern contract and should **FULFILL not only** the letter **but also** the intent of our contracts.

We have an obligation to determine the insurance needs of **our CUSTOMERS** and to **FULFILL** those needs as completely as possible.

We MUST FULFILL our PROMISES to OUR CUSTOMERS and we MUST NOT promise anything we cannot deliver.

We should strive **to build LONG-TERM CUSTOMER LOYALTY** and give the **UTMOST** CONSIDERATION to those who demonstrated LOYALTY!!

We have an **OBLIGATION TO TRAIN** our people **to enable** them to provide **SUPERIOR service** and **to adhere** to **OUR HIGH STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE**. OUR people have an obligation to accept training, **LEARN THEIR JOBS** and work continuously to **IMPROVE** their performance.

EVERYONE in our company should be friendly, RESPONSIVE, helpful, PROMPT, accurate, and CONSCIENTIOUS-not only of our CUSTOMERS, but of other employees, claimants, suppliers and general public.

EVERY person in our organization CONTRIBUTES TO OUR REPUTATION and should ADHERE TO OUR HIGH STANDARDS both on and off the job.

Case 2:22-cv-01451-GMN-DJA Document 57 Filed 02/13/23 Page 58 of 91

**EXHIBIT B** -WELCOMELETTER

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 57 OF 69



COLORADO SPRINGS CO 80949

Customer Service: 1-800-800-9410 Monday - Friday Saturday

6:00 A.M. 6:00 P.M. 8:00 A.M. 12:00 P.M. (PT)

Your renters policy number: 2A1 4197849

Dear JAMES VERNA.

Thank you for choosing California Casualty as your renters insurance provider. You've just taken advantage of specialized, tailored coverage available only to CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION members. We appreciate the opportunity to provide you with the excellent service and protection that has been a central mission of our company since our founding in 1914.

For accuracy, please review the enclosed insurance policy documents. If you have any questions, California Casualty is here for you. You can reach one of our award winning customer service team members at 1-800-800-9410. If you prefer to manage your account online and have access to your documents anytime from anywhere, visit www.calcas.com/go-paperless-new.

We are striving to be more than just your insurance company - we want to be a valuable resource too. Check out our blog at mycalcas.com for tips on getting the most out of your insurance, information on protecting your home and great "how to" ideas for your profession.

We thank you again for trusting us to protect what's important to you.

Sincerely.

Daphne Pavone

Vice President, Customer Service

California Casualty

P.S. We also offer personal umbrella policies, flood insurance, pet insurance and more! Please visit www.calcas.com for details.

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE



For questions on your policy or to report a loss, call 800-800-9410. This document can be viewed at calcas.com/My-Account.

Coverage provided by: CALIFORNIA CASUALTY INDEMNITY EXCHANGE

RENTERS POLICY DECLARATIONS AMENDED

Your policy is billed annually. Billing information will be mailed separately.

This replaces all previous declarations.

NAMED INSURED(S):

TRUST J TRUTH

San Francisco, CA 94112-3333

POLICY NUMBER:

2A1 4197849

POLICY PERIOD:

Effective 07/28/21 Expiration 07/28/22 12:01 A.M. Standard Time at the location of the property insured

Amendment Effective: 04/15/2022

THE RESIDENCE PREMISES COVERED BY THIS POLICY IS LOCATED AT:

150 Navajo Ave # C San Francisco, CA 94112-3333

**RATING INFORMATION:** 

Automatic Value-Up at Renewal

Residence: Primary Construction Type: Frame

**Protection Class: 01** 

Territory: U3

DEDUCTIBLE:

Section I Loss Deductible = \$250

Coverage is provided only where a limit of liability is shown or a premium is stated.

SECTION I PROPERTY LIMIT OF LIABILITY PREMIUMS
Coverage C - Personal Property \$ 225,000 \$ 941.00
Coverage D - Loss of Use \$ 67,500 Included

SECTION II LIABILITY

Coverage E - Personal Liability \$ 100,000 Each Occurrence \$ 3.00 Coverage F - Medical Payments to Others \$ 1,000 Each Person Included

ADDITIONAL COVERAGES

HO0407 Personal Property Replacement Cost Loss Settlement - California Included
HO0426 Limited Fungi, Wet or Dry Rot, or Bacteria Coverage Included
HO2490 Workers Compensation Residence Employees - California Included

TOTAL POLICY PREMIUM

\$ 944.00

04/15/22 Page: 1 of 2

THIS LINE HOMEOWNER	LOSS REPORT
Name of Insured States Villa	Policy No. 2A1 4197849 Claim No. 50000599839
Address	. nome Phone
LAS VEGAS, NV 94112	Susiness Phone
-	Email
Date of Loss or Accident 07/07/22 Location 150	NAVAJO AVE CA SAN FRANCISCO
Fire Dept or Police Notified?	CLEADE DOTO 7 JULY 2022
Fire Windstorm	Theft from Premises Personal Liability/Medical
Lightning Explosion Cause by Vehicle/Aircraft Vandalism	Glass Breskage
,	CTS
How did loss or damage occur? Describe in detail	<del></del>
- Clif-A-A-A-C-A	
JEE HILACHED SYL	71_
1	
DEDCON	AL IN ILIDV
-	AL INJURY
Name of Injured	
Address	Business Phone
Profession	-
Nature and extent of injuries	
If a minor, parents name	
PROPERT	Y DAMAGE
	RM. USE ADDITIONAL FORMS IF NECESSARY.
Owner of property damaged or stolen	Home Phone
Address	_ Agem
) on tary to	_
	NSURANCE
is there other insurance that should apply?	Name of Company
Policy Number	Agent
Company Address	Agent Phone
Date No. of Pages Inventory Forms	Submitted
For your protection, California law requires the following	to appear on this form:
"Any person who knowingly presents false or fraudulent	information to obtain or amend insurance coverage or
to make a claim for the payment of a loss is guilty of a c state prison."	rime and may be subject to fines and confinement in
Policy Holder's Signature	Date 25 / पार क्राज्य
LAIR LANGE & SIR ISTANCE TO A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	

PL-019 CA (10/16)



Case 2:22-cv-01451-GMN-DJA Document 57 Filed 02/13/23 Page 64 of 91 **EXHIBIT E -** SFPDRPT-3 pages COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE PAGE 60 OF 69

Case 2:22-cv-01451-GMN-DJA Document 57 Filed 02/13/23 Page 65 of 91

San Francisco Police Department 220447545 INCIDENT REPORT Report Type: Initial Occurrence To Date / Time **CAD Number** Reported Date / Time Incident Number Occurrence From Date / Time 07/07/2022 17:01 221882346 07/06/2022 15:30 07/08/2022 15:30 220-447-545 N Type of incident C MISCELLANEOUS INVESTIGATION 68020 I District D Location of Occurrence: At Intersection with/Premise Type INGLESIDE HOUSE 150 NAVAJO AVE E (Type of Weapon Used) Domestic Non-Suspect Use of Reporting Unit Suspect Confidential Arrest Suspect N Violence? Force? 3H00 Report? incident? Known? Unknown? Made? Ŧ Reporting District At Intersection with Location Sent / On View: INGLESID 1 SGT JOHN V YOUNG ST **SAN JOSE AVE** Juvenile **Prejudice** Star Date/ Time Elder Gana Crime and Clearance Status | Reported to Bureau | Name Based? Subia Victim Related? Have you reviewed the attached list of procedures required by Department General Order (DGO) 7.04? I declare under penalty of pertury, this report of \_3\_pages is true and correct, based on my personal knowledge, or is best following an investigation of the events and parties involved. d owinformation and belief D E F Post Training PROP 115 CERTIFIED C F Station Watch Date Star L Reporting Officer I Ingleside Station 1500-0100 07/07/22 20:54 4778 (PSA) BAUTISTA, GRACE M C Station Date R Star Reviewing Officer E 07/07/22 20:57 1550 Ingleside Station NOGUCHI, MARI K R Date Station Star OIC 07/07/22 20:58 Ingleside Station 1550 NOGUCHI, MARI K 0 Assigned by Re-essigned to Related Case Related Case GB 4778 Coples to 3°300 Emaîl Name (Lest, First Middle) R Code nat provided 1 TRUST, JUSTICE TRUTH **RV** 1 State Zip Code City Home Address Day Phone V Type I Zip Code City State **Night Phone** Work Address , Type C T Eye Color Hair Color ID Type Jurisd ID No. Height Weight DOB / Age DOB I BLU 180 GRY

Follow-up Form

 $\square$ 

Language Line Service/Interpreter ID#

YES

Statement

Other Information/If Interpreter Needed Specify Language

YES

 $\square$ 

Relationship to Subject

OTHER (NARRATIVE)

Bilingual Ofc Star#

SEPPO CITA Needed

Unk.

Violent Crime

Notification

293 PG

NOTINUOS

Language Description(if Other)

04/24/60

Confidential

School (if Juvenille)

Person 🔲

Interpreter

1--14--44 000447646

M

Case 2:22-cv-01451-GMN-DJA, Document 57 Filed 02/13/23 Page 66 of 91 San Francisco Police Department

220447545 INCIDENT REPORT Report Type: Initial Email Alas Code Name (Last, First Middle) not provided **S** 1 KONTRAFOURIS, TOM State Zin Coda U CRY Day Phone Type Home Address State Zio Code City Work Address P Night Phone Type E Eye Color Weight Hair Color Height Race Sex DOB Date of Birth or age between C Age GRY BRO 58 and 80 U Unknown 57 ID Type/Jurisdiction/Number ID Type/Jurisdiction/Number J/D# (If Juvi) ID Type/Jurisdiction/Number **SFNO Booking Location** Booking Charge(s) Dept# Enroute to Actions Court# Warrant # Bail Warrant Violation(a) of Appearance Appear Date/time Citation# Violation(s) Star Mirandized: Star Date Time CA Form Booked Copy Áttached Statement M X-Rays Mass Arrest Code Book/Cite Approval Other Information: Citation/Warrant/Booking Charge(s)/Missing Person-Subjection Scars, Marks, Tattoos SUSPECT IS RV1'S LANDLORD AT 150 NAVAJO AVE. Language Description(if(9ther) anguage Line Service/Interpreter ID# Billingual Ofc Star# Interpreter .anguage Needed Brand Model P Code/No Item Description R E EVD 1 STATEMENT 0 Narcotics Lab No. Quantity Value 1 Color Gun Make Sertal No. ₽ 1 B Seized by (Star) R V YOUNG LN (INGLESIDE STATION) T Additional Description/Identifying Numbers 🙅 Y VICTIM'S WRITTEN STATEMENT SUB-ART Model Brand P Code/No Item Description **VARIOUS** R S PERSONAL PR STN 1 Value 0 Narcotics Lab No. 1 Quantity Caliber Calor Gun Make Serial No. P \$500,000.00 Total E From Where Seized by (Star) R T n/identifying Numbers Y diture, jewelry, collections, belonging to RV1

1- -1----- 0004 47EAF

Case 2:22-cv-01451-GMN-DJA Document 57 Filed 02/13/23 Page 67 of 91

San Francisco Police Department INCIDENT REPORT

220447545

#### NARRATIVE

On 07/07/2022 at approximately 1701 hours, I was on duty at Ingleside Police Station when (RV1)Justice Truth Trust came to report a miscellaneous investigation.

Trust relayed the following information to me:

Report Type: Initial

On 07/06/2022 at approximately 1530 hours, after seven months of being out of town, Trust came back apartment at 150 Navajo Ave. When he tried to enter his unit, he discovered that a new gate had been installed and his key would not work. Additionally, he noticed that new windows, doors and metal security doors that been placed where his keys could not access. Trust told me that he paid for his rent during the time he had been out of town for seven months.

Trust said he further found out that all his (STN1)personal possessions, such as clothing ppliances, furniture and other miscellaneous collections were no longer in his unit when he peeked over the windows. Trust believed that all his belongings had been stolen by his landlord, (S1)Tom Kontrafouris. Trust said the flad no available witness, or video footage capturing Kontrafouris stealing his belongings.

messages, but he did not return his Trust told me that he attempted to call Kontrafouris several times and left him calls. Trust described Kontrafouris as Greek descent male, in his 80's approximately 5'8", 180 lbs., gray hair and brown eyes. Trust expressed his intention to press charges against the relief report for his insurance claim. police report for his insurance claim.

auacned Trust's statement to this report.

I provided Trust a Follow up form with a case number and Marsy's card. Trust wrote his (EVD1)statement about this incident and I boated it as evidence at Ingleside Station. I uploaded and

#### **AMENDED RENTER'S LOSS REPORT\***

\*THIS AMENDED RENTER'S LOSS REPORT CANCELS AND REPLACES THE EARLIER LOSS REPORT RECEIVED ON 25 JULY 2022 IN CONTENT ONLY BUT STILL RETAINS THE 25 JULY 2022 DATE AS THE DATE ON WHICH CCIE'S CLAIMS DEPARTMENT RECEIVED MY LOSS REPORT AND STARTED THE 30 CALENDAR OR WORK DAYS IN WHICH CCIE'S CLAIMS DEPARTMENT HAD TO PROVIDE ME AS DR. TRUST JUSTICE "TJ" TRUTH, ESQUIRE, WRITTEN ACCEPTANCE OR DENIAL OF MY CLAIM LOSS AS SET OUT BELOW OR A WRITTEN REQUEST FOR MORE TIME!!

Name of INSURED: DR. TRUST JUSTICE "TJ" TRUTH, ESQUIRE

POLICY NO. **2A1 419749** Claim #**50000599839** 

Address: 4030 S Jones Blvd., Ste 31587, Las Vegas, NV 89103

Date of Loss: 06 JULY 2022

Location of LOSS: **150 Navajo Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112-3333**Yes the SFPD at the Ingleside Station were Notified on 7 JULY 2022 and ISSUED SFPD Incident Report **#220447545** (SEE ATTACHED COPY)

#### **FACTS of THEFT FROM PREMISES**

ON 6 JULY 2022, I suffered a MOST EGREGIOUS, HORRIFIC, CATASTROPHIC and LIFE-ALTERING THEFT of ALL my personal property, with the exception of the clothes that I was wearing. Among the items STOLEN was my SAFE with ALL THE INFORMATION regarding my personal property, such as ALL the authentications for the autographed baseballs and ALL the receipts of the originally-purchased items. My STOLEN Personal Property was valued at over \$500,000 and that this was everything I owned or acquired for over the 62+ years of my life. I NEVER authorized the removal of my personal property NOR was it abandoned. I also reported this THEFT to the San Francisco Police Department ON 7 JULY 2022 and received SFPD Incident Report #220447545 detailing this THEFT.

IN A MORE SERIOUS MATTER, I am FORCED to continue to FEEL SICK to my stomach, SUFFER anxiety, HAVE confused emotions and rage. I am ALSO sleep deprived AND HAVE extreme lethargy as well as SLIDING FURTHER into AN ABYSS OF HOPELESSNESS and DESPAIR!! IN ADDITION, BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my Personal Property TAKEN, i.e., STOLEN, from me that I had acquired during 60+ years of my life for which I have yet to been compensated; I can NOT afford to seek competent TREATMENT for my EVER-WORSENING EMOTIONAL DISTRESS! When I do RECEIVE MY CLAIM, I will SEEK TREATMENT so that I can start REBUILDING some semblance of a LIFE, since mine has been RIPPED AWAY and STOLEN for me as well as being FORCED to watch OTHERS buying my STOLEN Personal Property, SOME IRREPLACEABLE ONE-OF-A-KIND ITEMS or FAMILY HEIRLOOMS!!

I have attached an UPDATED **Personal Property Loss Schedule** that will show that I have **LOST**MORE THAN the \$225,000 Personal Property LOSS LIMITATION of MY POLICY # 2A1419849. THIS

PROPERTY LOSS SCHEDULE is **NOT** COMPLETE and may be **UPDATED** as TIME PERMITS OR my

CLAIM IS FINALLY PAID!! HOWEVER, THIS SCHEDULE is **SUFFICIENT to ESTABLISH** that the

ACTUAL PURCHASE LOSS is GREATER THAN the POLICY'S LIMITATIONS and the ACTUAL

REPLACEMENT COST and the REPLACEMENT thereof is IRRELEVANT AND FULL CLAIM LOSS OF
\$225,000 SHOULD and MUST IMMEDIATELY BE PAID as the DEDUCTIBLE IS USED ONLY WHERE

REPLACEMENT COSTS ARE A FACTOR!! I have also attached the FIRST SET of RECEIPTS of the

REPLACEMENT ITEMS of my STOLEN PERSONAL PROPERTY as well as the RENTER'S POLICY

DECLARATION AMENDED-SHOWING NAME CHANGE on MY POLICY dated 15 APRIL 2022.

**DATED: 25 JULY 2022** 

**POLICY Holders Signature** 

DR. TRUST JUSTICE "7J" TRUTH,/ESQUIRE

### PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSS CLAIM #50000599839

(A) -1	PA:		4	·	0 10		
CITY.	PESCRIPTION	ONGINAL COST/ ESTIMATED PMV WHEN WHENTED	PLACE OF PURCHABE	DATE OF PURCHASE MM/YY	REPLACEMENT COST	COMPUTON	
1	Biaze Professional LUX 44-inch 4- Burner Properie Gas Grill BLZ-4PRO-LP with Cover & Propane Tank	\$6600	Dvorsón's Restauant Supply Sausalito, CA	12/2013	\$8700	2	
, 1	CANNON EOS MARK camera, batteries, battery charges, strapes, leather case + protection package	\$7500	USA Cannon	09/2020	\$8350	2	
1. q	RF15-30ram, RF5.2mm Dual Fisheye & RF400mm with filters, covers & hoods; cables; tripod and	\$21,399	USA Cannon	09/2020	\$24,450	2.	
1. [	Coach metro slim briefcase	\$475	CÖACH Store SF, CA	06/2003	\$600	2	
1	Coach league flap- backpack	\$475.	COACH Store SF, CA	06/2003	\$600	, <b>2</b> .	
5	Coach leather belts	\$825	COACH Store SF, CA	. 06/2003	<b>9</b> \$200 = \$1000*	2	
1	Balabushka Detachable Pool Cue Stick, Bag & Accessories	\$925	Pool Supplies & More Mission St, SF, CA	08/2008	\$1315	2	
1		\$365	Pool Supplies & More Mission St, SF, CA	08/2008	\$450	1	

OIV.	description	OFIGENAL COST/ ESTIMATED PMV WHITE WHITED	PLACE OF PURCHASE	DATE OF PURCHASE MIN/YY	REPLACEMENT	CONDITION "See Bejork
	ALL OTHER GROCERIES, ALCOHOL & HOUSEHOLD PRODUCTS NOT SPECIALLY MENTIONED	\$15,000	VARIOUS	VARIOUS	\$15,000°	1
	ALL OTHER CLOTHES, SHOES & ACCESSORIES including Sid and Running Apparel NOT SPECIALLY MENTIONED	\$100,000	VÅRIOUS	VARIOUS	\$100,000†	2
	ALL OTHER FURNITURE NOT SPECIALLY MENTIONED	\$50,000	VARIOUS	VARIOUS	\$75,000°	2
1	Signed Copy of Ferris Bueller's Day Off Movie Poster	\$1000	Sports & Memorable Shop on Geery Blvd In SF, CA	06/2004	\$1200	1
1 pair	Dorothy's RUBY Slippers from the Wizard of OZ	\$6000	Sports & Memorable Shop on Geery Blvd in SF, CA	06/2004	\$7500	1
1 1 }		\$1750	Valencia Cyclery	04/2019	\$2800*	2
1	Specialized Road Bicycle + Accessories	\$700	Valencia Cyclery	06/2004	\$1200*	2
1 1	Specialized Hybrid Bicycle + Accessories	\$750	Valencia Cyclery	06/2004	\$1200*	2
1137	CDs	\$13000	VARIOUS	VARIOUS	\$25,000*	2
357	DVDs & VHS	\$8925	VARIOUS	VARIOUS	\$20,000*	2
proper us specifical	ALL OTHER OFFICE PRODUCTS Including Computers & SUPPLIES NOT SPECIALLY MENTIONED	\$15,650	VARIOUS	VARIOUS	\$17,975 <b>*</b>	1/2

OTY	DESCRIPTION	ORIGINAL COST/ ESTIMATED PMV WHENTED	PLACE OF PURICHASE	DATE OF PLINCHASE MILETY	REPLACEMENT COST	CONDITION The Below
2	Samsung Galaxy S21 ULTRAs + Accessories	\$1500 <b>@</b> 2 = \$3000	VARIOUS	VARIOUS	\$1700 <b>@</b> 2 = \$3400°	5/5
1	Handmade Leather Bomber Jacket	*\$7500	Shoe & Leather Repairs in Burlingeme, CA	03/2008	\$12,000	**4
1 .	Baseball autographed by DiMaggio/ Mantle/Maris	\$22000	Sports & Memorable Shop on Geary Blvd in SF, CA	06/2004	\$30000	2
1 +	Baseball autographed by Ted Williams	\$3500	Sports & Memorable Shop on Geary Blvd in SF, CA	06/2004	\$5000	2
1	Baseball autographed by Ruth/Gehrig	\$45000	Sports & Memorable Shop on Geary Blvd in SF, CA	06/2004	\$69000	2
1 '	Baseball autographed by Fred Lynn after he hit the Game Winning HR that I caught at an Orioles Game	FREE	N/A	N/A	\$300	2
	Camping Gear	\$3500	REI-Various	VARIOUS	\$4000	2
1	Maytag Washing Machine	\$250	From the Landlord	07/2021	\$650	2
	ALL OTHER Books including BAR REVIEW and Legal NOT SPECIALLY MENTIONED	\$25,000	VARIOUS	VARIOUS	\$30,000*	2/5
1	1st Edition of The Adventures of Tom Sawyer	\$7500	Rare Bookstore NYC	07/2004	\$12,000	1
1	Tiffany Studios Dragonfly Table Lamp	\$25,000	Antique Store in NYC	07/2004	\$58,680	1

av	DESCRIPTION	ORIGINAL COST/ ESTIMATED FAIV MHEN INHERITED	PLACE OF PURCHASE	DIGIE OF	REPLACIEMENT COST	CONDITION See Solds
1	1st Edition of MARY POPPINS	\$12,500	Rare Bookstore NYC	07/2004	\$20,000	1
1 of each	Boxing Gloves & Marathon Shirt autographed by Mohammad Ali at Pre-Marathon Pasta Dinner where he was starting the LA Marathon	\$65 for Pair, Shirt Free with Registration Fee & \$50 ticket for Dinner	Sports Store in LA	03/1996	\$8000	2
1	Datejust OysterQuartz Steel & White Gold Bracelet 36 mm ROLEX WATCH-PhD Graduation Present	\$6000	<b>N/A</b>	07/1998	\$10,700	1
1	SUNCAST 8' X 10° Outdoor Storage Shed	\$1800	LOWES	06/2014	\$2100	2
.1	Father's DayDate ROLEX Watch	\$27,500 (FMV)	N/A	N/A	, \$40,000	1
1 of each	Redskin's Helmet & Jersey autographed by Sonny Jurgensen at the Crab Shack in Washington, DC	\$125	RFK Stadium	11/1984	\$6000°	5/2
1 of each	Ovechkin's "8" Hockey Jersey & Official NHL Hockey Puck autographed by Alex Ovechkin during the 2nd Intermission where I was selected to "Shot on Goal"	\$85/Free & \$55 Game Ticket	MCI Center	12/2010	\$6500	2/1

απν	DESCRIPTION	ORIGINAL COST/ ESTIMATED PMV WHISE HIHERITED	PLACE OF PURCHASE	DATE OF PURCHASE MALYY	REPLACEMENT	CONDITION "See Below
	Hardy Cognac Privilege 750ml	\$10,999	Cognac Expert	12/2015	\$13,700	1
· 1	55" HDTV- Reverse Projection	\$8000	Best Buy	06/2004	\$4500	2
	ALL OTHER HOUSEHOLD APPLICANCES NOT SPECIALLY MENTIONED	\$24,500	VARIOUS	VARIOUS	\$35,000°	2s & 5
1	1st Edition of Uncle Tom's Cabin	\$8500	Rare Bookstore NYC	07/2004	\$11,500	1
	ALL OTHER Stereo Equipment NOT SPECIALLY MENTIONED	\$17,675	VARIOUS	VARIOUS	\$25,875*	1 & 5

- 1 = New, may still be in packing or Excellent Condition for usage/age of item
- 2 = Above Average Condition for usage/age of item
- 3 = Average Condition for usage/age of item
- 4 = Below Average Condition for usage/age of item
- 5 = Item Placed after loss

## \*RECEIPTS ATTACHED

\*\*THIS PROPERTY LOSS SCHEDULE IS NOT COMPLETE and may be UPDATED as TIME PERMITS OR my CLAIM IS FINALLY PAID!! HOWEVER, THIS SCHEDULE IS SUFFICIENT tO ESTABLISH that the ACTUAL PURCHASE LOSS IS GREATER THAN the POLICY'S LIMITATIONS and the ACTUAL REPLACEMENT COST and the REPLACEMENT thereof is IRRELEVANT AND FULL CLAIM LOSS OF \$225,000 SHOULD and MUST IMMEDIATELY BE PAID as the DEDUCTIBLE IS USED ONLY WHERE REPLACEMENT COSTS ARE A FACTOR!!

25 July 2022 |

Claim #5000599839

Dear Ms. Stephanie Castillo,

Attached are the properly executed and complete PROOF OF LOSS requirements needed for you to process the settlement and offer payment of my Claim as well as establish that California Casualty Indemnity Exchange (hereinafter "CCIE") is legally liable to me on this Claim. I implore you to please complete this settlement process of my Claim as soon as possible as I am almost destitute and soon will not be able to afford somewhere for me to stay and will remain HOMELESS due to being LOCKED OUT by my landlord and his refusal to admit to this crime or provide me with a statement that during my tenancy I paid my rent on time for almost ten years and that the lease terminated with us on good terms; without this statement from your former landlord no one is willing to rent to me. Accordingly, I have been forced to leave San Francisco and move to Las Vegas in order to bring legal action against him and San Francisco for their actions and conduct regarding this matter. Without my Claim funds, my life is on stand-still and I can not even afford to purchase items that I see on eBay that were stolen from me. Instead, I am forced to watch these items, such as family heirlooms and 1-of-a-kind/ non-replaceable items, get bought by others and my past life slowly disappear forever! Moreover I am forced to have ripped from me, my life's work (such as losing the only copy of my PhD Thesis), dreams and memories and have them replaced with EMOTIONAL SCARING as well as not being able to afford to purchase suitable clothing to interview for employment and once employment is found to purchase suitable clothing for work!

As a reminder to you, this CLAIM relates to me being **LOCKED OUT** by the Landlord, Tom Kontrafouris, residing at 1635 45th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94122 on **6 JULY 2022** and **over \$500,000** of my Personal Property **stolen** from my Rental at 150 Navajo Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112-3333 and that this was everything I owned or acquired for over the **60**+ **years** of my life **and all I have to my name is the clothes that I am wearing!** 

I contacted CCIE to report a claim on 11 July 2022 and had the Fraudulent Organization's, the 3rd-Party Call Center's, "Representative" repeat back to me the information regarding my Claim. I also made him repeat the SFPD Incident Report of #220447545. I further made sure that he reported that my SAFE with all information regarding the loss, such as the authentications for the autographed baseballs and all receipts of the originally-purchased items, was STOLEN as well. I was told that I would be emailed the Claim #, the Claim Agent's Name and Telephone # and my email address for receiving said information was confirmed. I NEVER received said email with this information! I was further told that the Adjuster/ Estimator would contact me asap regarding this matter. I have yet to be contacted by you!!

Please note that your automatically-generated standardized Claim Loss Mailing Packet has the following glaring errors that questions the competency of you and your insurance company:

- 1. Wrong Insured Name,
- 2. Wrong Mailing Zip code,
- 3. Inclusion of #C on the 150 Nevada Avenue location because CCIE has been informed that the addition of #C is considered as evidence of MAIL FRAUD and the rental location must be identified as only 150 Navajo Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112-3333, and
- 4. This is not a Renter's Loss Report Form.

To speed up this process, I went to several stores in order to try to get an estimation of what the value of the stolen property would be. To my chagrin, none of them were legally allowed to

provide that type of information and would not help me out in this endeavor to establish the value. However, some stores like Field of Dreams and Rolex, had very similar items to those stolen and so I was able get replacement costs for those items. I limited the Schedule of Losses to those items for which I was able to find replacements and the cost of those replacement items until I was well over the loss liability coverage limit of \$225,000.

With respect to LOSS OF USE, I was "locked out" and as such I am entitled to be compensated for similar accommodations, i.e. a fully furnished 2 bedroom apartment with kitchen at \$1950 per night. In addition, BUT FOR your the BAD FAITH, OUTRAGEOUS and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT in the handling and processing of my Claim for which CCIE is legally liable and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired during 60+ years of my life leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name for which this claim still remains unprocessed and unpaid; CCIE is liable to continue to pay for this LOSS OF USE until at least the \$67,500 coverage limit is reached.

This is a LIFE-ALTERING LOSS in which everything that I had acquired during 60+ years of my life was stolen for me leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name; it would be UNCONSCIONABLE for me to be required to replace all these items at age 62. Instead the entire Claim of \$292,500 should be paid out so that I can use these funds to rebuild some semblance of my life that has been RIPPED from me!

Moreover, your outrageous and oppressive conduct, such as your failure to return my many voicemails to you or to reply to my many emails to you is having an adverse effect on my health and I am forced to continue to feel sick to my stomach, suffer anxiety, confused emotions and rage. I am also sleep deprived and have extreme lethargy as well as sliding further into an abyss of hopelessness and despair. Furthermore, BUT FOR your the BAD FAITH, OUTRAGEOUS and OPPRESSIVE CONDUCT in the handling and processing of my Claim for which CCIE is legally liable and BECAUSE I had over \$500000 of my personal property STOLEN from me that I had acquired during 60+ years of my life leaving me with only the clothes that I had on to my name for which this claim still remains unprocessed and unpaid; I can NOT afford to seek competent treatment for my ever-worsening emotional distress! When I do receive my Claim, I will seek treatment so that I can start rebuilding some semblance of a life, since mine has been stolen forever for me and can never be replaced!

Best, Dr. Trust Justice Truth, Esquire the 2ND COMING, the ONCOMING STORM, the CREATOR's Attorney to RIGHT the WRONGs of the WORLD and Humankind's Best Hope of SURVIVAL! 702.686.0907

### ATTACHMENTS:

- 1. the SFPD Incident Report #220447545;
- 2. a detailed written statement regarding the loss that clearly establishes CCIE's liability for my Claim of both Personal Property Loss and Loss of Use Coverage and that my Safe having all information regarding my Personal Property was taken as well;
- 3. a detailed Personal Property Loss Schedule totaling almost \$130,000 in Actual Damages and \$250,000 in Replacement Costs as I purchased this benefit as well as providing you NOTICE that I want the benefit of the replacement cost coverage; and
- 4. a corrected Loss Report with the correct information5. CCIE's CODE you are supposed to abide by!

Case 2:22-cv-01451-GMN	BIAN DOCHE	nent7 F	02/13/23	Page 80 of 91	
AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action			1		
UNITED	STATES D	) ISTRIĆ	T COURT	DRECEI	1
1	for the	۲,		COUNSEL/PARTIES OF RE	CORD
ı	District of N	Vevada		SEP - 6 2022	
1		1,			
	)		CLERK	US DISTRICT COUR TRICT OF NEVADA	T
DR TRUST JUSTICE "TJ" TRUTH, ES	iQ 3		BY:	<b>_</b>	EPUTY
Plaintiff(s)	<del></del> ;				
v.	)	Civil Ac	tion No.		
	,	2.2	₽-cv-014	451-GMN-BN	J/V
CALIFORNIA CASUALTY INDEMNITY EXC	HANGE )				,
(THE)	)	ŀ	•		
Defendant(s)		j.	•		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
SU	MMONS IN A C	IVIL ACTI	ON .1		;
To: (Defendant's name and address) CALLECTION	zen, Agent of Ser CASUALTY INDI	vice for	I I CLANCE /THE	[	
CALIFORNIA 1875 S. GRAF	NT STREET, SUI	TE 800	PLANAGE (111E	.) 	
SAN MATEO		ŀ	· d		
,			· K		
1			<i>T</i>		ſ
					<b>!</b>
A lawsuit has been filed against you.					•
Within 21 days after service of this st	ummons on you (	not counting	the day you re	ceived it) or 60 days	s if you
are the United States or a United States agence	v. or an officer of	r employee o	of the United St	tates described in Fed. I	R. Civ.
P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the p the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The an	iainuit an answei swer or motion m	r to the attact	d on the plaint	iff or plaintiff's attorney	12 OI /,
and and a second and distance areas	JSTICE "TJ" TRU	i	i		
4030 S. JONE	S BLVD., SUITE		1		
LAS VEGAS, 702.686.0907			, <b>9</b>		
tjtruthesq@gn					
i i			<u> </u>		
If you fail to respond, judgment by d	efault will be ente	ered against	you for the reli	ef demanded in the con	ıplaint.
You also must file your answer or motion wit	th the court.		<b>{                                    </b>		
EBRA K. KEMPI	A		September 1	19, 2022	
S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S		ATE			
One Ltoo	週				
DEPUTY CLERK				·	
7.19	7		n •	1	
·					
			1		

Case 2:22-cv-01451-GMN-DJA Document 57 Filed 02/13/23 Page 81 of 91

		DISTRIC	ct of Nevaga				
	Notice of	Electronic	Filing				
1	The follow 9/19/2022 9/19/2022	2 at 11:09 /	ection was entered o AM PDT and filed or	n เ			
	Case Name:		ustice "TJ" Truth, Es Casualty Indemnity (The)	quire v			
	Case Number: Filer:	2:22-cv-01	451-GMN-BNW				
	Documen t Number:	7					
	Docket Te SUMMON Indemnity (TRW)	IS ISSUED	as to California Cas e (The) re 1-1 Comp	ualty laint.			
		2:22-cv-01451-GMN-BNW Notice has been electronically mailed to:					
	Truck luc	tion Truth	titrutheed@dmail	com			

Trust Justice Truth tjtruthesq@gmail.com

2:22-cv-01451-GMN-BNW Notice has been delivered by other means to:

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:





EXHIBIT K - NRS §686A.310-2 pages

COMPLAINT FOR A CIVIL CASE

PAGE 6 OF 69

### NRS 686A.310 Unfair practices in settling claims; liability of insurer for damages

- 1. Engaging in any of the following activities is considered to be an unfair practice:
- (a) Misrepresenting to insureds or claimants pertinent facts or insurance policy provisions relating to any coverage at issue.
- (b) Failing to acknowledge and act reasonably promptly upon communications with respect to claims arising under insurance policies.
- (c) Failing to adopt and implement reasonable standards for the prompt investigation and processing of claims arising under insurance policies.
- (d) Failing to affirm or deny coverage of claims within a reasonable time after proof of loss requirements have been completed and submitted by the insured.
- (e) Failing to effectuate prompt, fair and equitable settlements of claims in which liability of the insurer has become reasonably clear.
- (f) Compelling insureds to institute litigation to recover amounts due under an insurance policy by offering substantially less than the amounts ultimately recovered in actions brought by such insureds, when the insureds have made claims for amounts reasonably similar to the amounts ultimately recovered.
- (g) Attempting to settle a claim by an insured for less than the amount to which a reasonable person would have believed he or she was entitled by reference to written or printed advertising material accompanying or made part of an application.
- (h) Attempting to settle claims on the basis of an application which was altered without notice to, or knowledge or consent of, the insured, or the representative, agent or broker of the insured.
- (i) Failing, upon payment of a claim, to inform insureds or beneficiaries of the coverage under which payment is made.
- (j) Making known to insureds or claimants a practice of the insurer of appealing from arbitration awards in favor of insureds or claimants for the purpose of compelling them to accept settlements or compromises less than the amount awarded in arbitration.
- (k) Delaying the investigation or payment of claims by requiring an insured or a claimant, or the physician of either, to submit a preliminary claim report, and then requiring the subsequent submission of formal proof of loss forms, both of which submissions contain substantially the same information.
- (I) Failing to settle claims promptly, where liability has become reasonably clear, under one portion of the insurance policy coverage in order to influence settlements under other portions of the insurance policy coverage.
- (m) Failing to comply with the provisions of NRS 687B.310 to 687B.390, inclusive, or 687B.410.

- (n) Failing to provide promptly to an insured a reasonable explanation of the basis in the insurance policy, with respect to the facts of the insured's claim and the applicable law, for the denial of the claim or for an offer to settle or compromise the claim.
- (o) Advising an insured or claimant not to seek legal counsel.
- (p) Misleading an insured or claimant concerning any applicable statute of limitations.
- 2. In addition to any rights or remedies available to the Commissioner, an insurer is liable to its insured for any damages sustained by the insured as a result of the commission of any act set forth in subsection 1 as an unfair practice.

(Added to NRS by 1975, 1285; A 1987, 1067; 1991, 2202)

# NAC 686A.675 Standards applicable to all insurers. (NRS 679B.130, 686A.015, 686A.310)

- 1. Within **30 working days** after receipt by the insurer of properly executed proofs of loss, the first-party claimant must be advised of the acceptance or denial of the claim by the insurer. No insurer may deny a claim on the grounds of a specific policy provision, condition or exclusion unless reference to that provision, condition or exclusion is included in the denial. The denial must be given to the claimant in writing and filed and retained in the insurer's claim file. If the claim of the first-party claimant is accepted, the insurer shall pay the claim within 30 days after it is accepted. If the accepted claim is not paid within that period, the insurer shall pay interest on the claim at the rate of interest established pursuant to NRS 99.040. The interest must be calculated from the date on which the payment is due until the claim is paid.
- 2. If a claim is denied for reasons other than those described in subsection 1, and is made by any means other than writing, an appropriate notation must be made in the claim file of the insurer.
- 3. If the insurer **needs more time to determine** whether a claim of a first-party claimant should be accepted or denied, it must so notify the claimant within 30 working days after receipt of the proof of loss giving reasons that more time is needed. If the investigation remains incomplete, the insurer shall, 30 days after the date of the initial notification and every 30 days thereafter, send to the claimant a letter setting forth the reasons that additional time is needed for investigation.
- 4. Insurers may not fail to settle first-party claims on the basis that responsibility for payment should be assumed by others except as provided by policy provisions.
- 5. Insurers may not delay settlement of a claim directly with a claimant who is not an attorney or represented by an attorney by extending negotiations until the claimant's rights may be affected by a statute of limitations or a time limit which is part of an insurance contract or policy, without giving the claimant written notice that the time limit may be expiring and may affect the claimant's rights. Notice must be given 60 days before the date on which a time limit may expire.
- 6. No insurer may make statements which indicate that the rights of a third-party claimant may be impaired if a form or release is not completed within a given time, unless the statement is given for the purpose of notifying the third-party claimant of the provision of a statute of limitations.
- 7. Except for a claim involving health insurance, any case involving a claim in which there is a dispute over any portion of the insurance policy coverage, payment for the portion or portions not in dispute must be made notwithstanding the existence of the dispute where payment can be made without prejudice to any interested party.

### NAC 686A.670 Investigation of claims. (NRS 679B.130, 686A.015, 686A.310)

- 1. Each insurer shall establish procedures to begin an investigation of any claim within 20 working days of receipt of notice of the claim. Each insurer shall mail or otherwise provide to each claimant, a notice of all items, statements and forms, if any, which the insurer reasonably believes will be required of the claimant, within 20 working days after receiving notice of the claim.
- 2. Each insurer shall complete an investigation of each claim within 30 days after receiving notice of the claim, unless the investigation cannot reasonably be completed within that time.

[Comm'r of Insurance, M-9 § 7, eff. 2-21-80]

NAC 686A.665 Insurer to acknowledge receipt of claim notice within certain period; insurer, agent or administrator to respond adequately and within certain period to inquiry from Division respecting claim filed with Division; reply required within certain period to certain communications from claimants. (NRS 679B.130, 686A.015, 686A.310)

- 1. Every insurer shall acknowledge the receipt of a claim notice within 20 working days after receipt of the claim notice unless payment of the claim is made within that time. If acknowledgment is made by means other than writing, an appropriate dated notation of the acknowledgment must be made in the claim file of the insurer. Notice given to an agent of an insurer is notice to the insurer.
- 2. Each insurer, agent or administrator, upon receipt of any inquiry from the Division respecting a claim filed with the Division shall, within 10 working days after receipt of the inquiry, furnish the Division with an adequate response to the inquiry. The Division will not consider an acknowledgment of the receipt of an inquiry to be an adequate response to the inquiry. An insurer, agent or administrator who has received such an inquiry may request an extension of time, not to exceed 20 working days, to submit an adequate response. The request for an extension must be furnished to the Division within 10 working days after the insurer, agent or administrator received the inquiry.
- 3. An appropriate reply must be made within 20 working days after receipt of any other pertinent communication from a claimant if the communication reasonably suggests that a response is expected.
- 4. Each insurer, upon receiving notification of claim, shall promptly provide necessary claim forms, instructions and reasonable assistance so that first-party claimants can comply with the policy conditions and the insurer's reasonable requirements. Compliance with this subsection within 20 working days after receipt of notification of a claim constitutes compliance with subsection 1.
- 5. As used in this section, "administrator" has the meaning ascribed to it in NRS 683A.025.

[Comm'r of Insurance, M-9 § 6, eff. 2-21-80] — (NAC A 5-27-92; A by Div. of Insurance by R089-98, 9-25-98)